

THE  
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

---

APRIL 1837.

---

No. II.

---

---

ART. I. — *The Reformation in Hungary and Transylvania.*

By the persecutions carried on against the Albigenses and Waldenses, many of these devoted people were scattered through other countries, where they became a seed of reformation. The followers of John Huss and Jerome of Prague were also numerous and widely dispersed in the eastern parts of Europe, which prepared the way for the dissemination of evangelical doctrines in these regions after the reformation commenced in Germany and Switzerland. This will in some measure account for the rapidity with which the doctrines of the reformation spread through almost every part of Christendom. It is, however, greatly to be lamented that in many places no permanent record was made of the first planting of reformed churches. Those persons who were the instruments of propagating this blessed reformation, and who were capable of writing a correct history of events, were too much occupied with their more important labours to have leisure for things of this kind: and it is generally the fact, that men do not consider the importance of transmitting passing events by means of accurate records to posterity; so that often the witnesses of important transactions in the church and state pass off the stage before the importance of

preserving their testimony is felt. Hence it has been found very difficult to trace the progress of the reformation in several countries where it obtained an extended influence. This is especially true in respect to those nations in which, by the violence of persecution and the insidious arts of the Jesuits, the light of the reformed churches has been nearly extinguished. Dr. M'Crie, of Scotland, has laboured with some success in collecting facts, not commonly known, in regard to the progress of the reformation in Italy and Spain, where the truth was soon suppressed, and the professors of the true religion dispersed or murdered. But in regard to the progress of the reformation in the countries to the east of Germany, our accounts are still exceedingly meager. The history of the reformation in Poland and Bohemia is but little known among us; and as to Hungary, it seems to be scarcely known at all that the reformation ever extended so far to the east. We are not aware that any distinct account of the many churches planted in this rich country is to be met with in our language. At least we must confess our own ignorance of this part of ecclesiastical history, until a friend, not long since, put into our hands a volume written on this subject, by the learned Frederick Adolphus Lampe, whose praise is in all the reformed churches.

It appears from authentic documents, that in Hungary and Transylvania there were many who perceived, and groaned under the sad corruptions of the church, and earnestly desired a reformation both in the clergy and the people. Hence, within one year from the commencement of the reformation in Saxony, some rays of light were shed on this benighted region by means of a book, brought into the country by travelling merchants, in which the horrible crime of idolatry, and the punishment by which a just God pursued it, were set forth in forcible language. This had the effect of turning the minds of many people against the reigning system of popery. And it is distinctly recorded by some credible authors of that period, that in 1521 some of Luther's works were brought into Transylvania, and were read with avidity, so that by this means the eyes of many were opened. His tracts *on Christian Liberty—on Confession—on a Twofold Righteousness—on Penitence—on Baptism—on the Passion of Christ—on Monastic Vows—on Communion in both kinds—on the Babylonish Captivity—and his Exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians*, are specified as having been circulated in these regions.



In the years 1522, 1523, 1524, the evangelical doctrines made great progress in Upper Hungary, and also in Transylvania; and several popular preachers came forward and boldly denounced popery as an idolatrous system. Who these preachers were is not certainly known, but two of them were arrested and brought before the archbishop of Strigonia; and king Lewis issued several decrees against the innovators. In one of these we find the names of Ambrosius, and an abbot of the order of Preachers, who appear to have been leaders in the reformation now commenced.

It is recorded by Thomas Faber, who has written a narrative of the commencement of the reformation in Hungary, that five principal cities embraced the new religion, and that the ministers who were chiefly instrumental in bringing about the change were Simon Grynæus and Vitus Winshemius, who had their residence at Buda. But these learned and excellent reformers were soon banished from the country: Grynæus took up his abode at Basel, where he was chosen professor of philosophy, and Vitus was made professor of the Greek language at Wittenberg. From other sources of evidence it appears, that Grynæus was imprisoned before he was exiled, but was released by the intercession of certain noblemen of Hungary.

Scultet moreover relates that the Lutheran doctrines were preached by one Antony in Transylvania, who was himself a native of the country; and says that he had seen a letter addressed by Luther to this man, in which he exhorts him to constancy, and urges upon him the importance of adhering firmly to the doctrine which he had received. In this letter he complains of John, a preacher of Cibinium, who had embraced the opinions of the Sacramentarians. Scultet also declares that he had seen many epistles of Luther and Melancthon addressed to the churches and to the nobility of Transylvania and Hungary, from which it is manifest that they were all strongly attached to the Saxon Confession. Indeed, it appears that Luther and Melancthon sent two distinguished men from Wittenberg to institute churches and schools in those regions. These missionaries were John Honter and Leonard Stockelius.

Grynæus, after he was settled at Basel, laboured sincerely to reconcile the Lutherans and Zuinglians; but it is known that in this controversy his own opinions coincided with those of Oecolampadius, Bucer, Calvin, &c., with whom he lived on terms of the most intimate friendship.

In the year 1526, the archbishop of Buda, with the whole body of the monks, endeavoured to obtain from king Lewis a decree, devoting to destruction all that professed the Lutheran heresy; and requesting that count Pemphlinger, who favoured the reformers, should be cut off also. But at this time a formidable army of Turks was pressing on the territory of the king; so that, although he issued severe laws against the Lutherans, yet he deferred their execution until he should return from the military expedition which now called for all his energies. He wrote, however, to the count, and promised him his royal favour if he would exert himself to extirpate this sect. The count, without doing any thing respecting religion, set off to see the king; but before he reached his camp, he heard the sad tidings of the total defeat of the king's forces by the Turks. Before the return of count Pemphlinger, the monks endeavoured to have the king's orders against the Protestants carried into effect; and urged the Cibinensian senate to proceed against George, the preacher before mentioned, and to proscribe all of this sect. And they would have succeeded in their cruel purpose, had not the count opportunely returned, who shielded them from persecution, and took John into his own house that he might be secure from the rage and violence of the monks, who thirsted for his blood. The persecution determined on by the king was however prevented by the providence of God; for at the famous defeat of the Hungarian forces at Mohatz, he and all the flower of his nobility, and many dignified ecclesiastics were slain. The king and those around him sought refuge in a morass, where they were pursued and overtaken, and miserably slaughtered.

Count Pemphlinger, upon receiving the sad intelligence of the death of the king, went into Transylvania to consult about a successor. The monks, as soon as he was gone, again urged the magistrates of Cibinium to banish and proscribe George and his associates, and their efforts would not have proved ineffectual, had they not again been disappointed by the return of the count; for no sooner had he arrived than he again took this Silesian preacher under his protection and into his house; and permitted him publicly to exercise his ministry. The consequence was that the light of the gospel, by degrees, shone not only upon this town, but in many other places in that country.

In the mean time John was elected king of Hungary, who, that he might curry favour with the clergy and the monks,



thundered out his anathemas against the Lutherans, and commenced against them a violent persecution. This royal mandate was issued January 21, 1527. It appears, also, that the king was much displeased with the inhabitants of Cibinium, because he understood that they hung in doubt whether they would take part with him, or adhere to Ferdinand, his competitor. But these threatening measures produced very little effect in retarding the progress of the gospel; especially as king John, in a short time, was entirely overthrown by Ferdinand, and was obliged to fly into Poland, leaving Transylvania without a ruler, which was governed in his absence by Alexius Bethelenius.

The gospel now, for several successive years, made great progress in Hungary, so that a large part of the nobles, counts, and barons embraced the evangelical doctrine. Ferdinand, who had obtained undisturbed possession of the kingdom, was a person of great moderation, and sought rather to reconcile the contending religious parties than to exasperate them; and recommended that, prejudice aside, they should confer amicably with one another, and endeavour to come to some agreement. But the Papists would listen to no terms. They were resolved to treat with the Lutherans in no other way than by fire and sword; and insisted on the execution of the royal edicts which king John had promulged against them. But the Lutherans in Cibinium, having now become a large majority, began to retaliate upon their persecutors, and on the 18th of February 1529, published an edict, requiring all the monks, on pain of death, and all who followed their tenets, within three days, to leave the place, or renounce the Popish religion: and so unexpected was the success of this measure, that within the time prescribed, no one remained in the place who adhered to the monks.

In the year 1530 five free cities in Upper Hungary presented a confession of their faith to Ferdinand, king of Hungary and Bohemia.

There lived at this time a woman who was an eminent instrument of promoting the reformation both in Upper and Lower Hungary. This was Ann, the widow of Peter Jaxith. By her influence John Vitus, a man celebrated throughout Hungary, was made professor in the college at Patak. She also was instrumental in bringing forward and patronizing many other men of learning and worth. And as many of the young men of Hungary resorted to Wittenberg for education, she greatly aided the funds of that important institution.

That noble and eminent man, Caspar Dragfius, disregarding the wrath of the king and bishops, did, from the first, greatly promote the cause of the reformation in the towns over which his jurisdiction extended, using especially the instrumentality of those zealous preachers of evangelical doctrine, Devai, Batizi, and Dereskei, and furnished a safe asylum for such Protestants as were persecuted in other places.

At this time some success attended the efforts of evangelical men to introduce the gospel into Barcia, but the union of the Turks and Wallachians, and their sudden irruption into Transylvania, cut off all communication with this province. Hitherto the Lutherans only had gained an entrance into Hungary; but in 1531 the inhabitants of Patak erected a commodious house of worship for the reformed, and in the same year laid the foundation of a famous school or college in that place.

In the year 1532, king John having again got possession of Buda, the Romish clergy left no means untried to induce him to exert all his power to suppress the reformation. And Statelius, by favour of the king, having obtained the episcopal dignity in the city of Weissenburg, exercised unheard of cruelties towards all who frequented the meetings of the Lutherans, or received their books. This bishop was a Dalmatian by nation, and a sensual epicurean in his sentiments and habits of life. And that he might confirm the people in the Popish faith, he circulated the foulest slanders against the Lutherans, charging them with every species of wickedness. He inflicted an exemplary punishment on a certain priest who had said, in a public discourse, that the eating of flesh was a thing indifferent in itself, and not prohibited in the holy scriptures. For, having first reproved this preacher with much severity, he sent him to prison, where, by order of the bishop, he was committed to the public executioner to be scourged with rods from morning until the evening; and this was continued until the bishop could invent some more cruel mode of punishment. That to which he resorted was to have him dragged out of the prison by the lictors, and his body loaded with dead hares, geese, and other animals, and then to set the dogs on him to hunt him through the public streets of the city; until, being torn to pieces, he miserably perished; a sad spectacle to many, but a sport to the wicked. But the bishop did not long escape the deserved punishment of such cruelty; for, a few days after, being seized with re-



morse of conscience, he was soon reduced to insanity, and died a maniac on the 4th of November in this year.

One of the most distinguished preachers among the reformed was Matthias Devai, whose labours and influence were such in spreading evangelical doctrines, that he received the appellation of the *Hungarian Luther*. But this distinguished man entertained no bigoted attachment to the Saxon confession, for it is well known, that in regard to the dispute concerning the eucharist, he followed the creed of the Helvetic churches. But the fact was, that in the earlier stages of the reformation in Hungary, this matter was not disputed, and occasioned no division among evangelical men. They who held dissentient opinions willingly tolerated one another. How conspicuous Devai was in the commencement of the Hungarian reformation is abundantly attested by the annals and publications of those times. By his instrumentality that noble patron of the reformation, Caspar Dragfus, already mentioned, was brought over to embrace the gospel. His influence was not confined to one town, but his light shone around to a wide extent. He boldly preached the gospel at Buda, the former capital of the kingdom; and gained many proselytes, even from among the courtiers of king John. In consequence he was taken and cast into prison at Buda, from which he was delivered in a very extraordinary manner. And afterwards, while preaching the gospel in that part of the country which bordered on Austria, he was again seized and imprisoned in Vienna. Devai held a public disputation with a Franciscan monk, named Gregory Szegedinus, which was printed, and to which are added "an Apology for certain Doctrines, and a Summary of the Christian Religion." This work is dedicated to "Martin Luther, the apostle of Christ." The title of a dispute which Devai held with the bishop of Constance is "concerning the state of the souls of the blessed after this life, and before the day of judgment;" and also, "concerning the principal doctrines of the Christian religion:" to which is added "notes of his examination while in prison by Faber." The articles on account of which he was condemned by Faber, were twenty-seven in number, and were the common doctrines of the reformed.

It is a remarkable parallelism in the events of the life of Devai, that he was imprisoned by both the kings of Hungary, John and Ferdinand; by the first at Buda, and by the last at Vienna. That in each place he had a conference with a man called Faber, but with very different results. When in the

prison of Buda, the smith of the king, who had injured the king's horse in shoeing him, was confined in the same apartment. This man was converted in the prison by the instructions of Devai, and most cordially embraced the gospel. The king's horse having quickly recovered from the injury, orders were given to release the smith (Faber), and to retain Devai in confinement to be burnt. The smith declared himself to be of the same opinion with Devai, and that he was ready to suffer with him for the gospel. Upon this the king, to the surprise of every one, gave orders that both of them should be released unconditionally.

After a long contest for the kingdom of Hungary, the two competitors, John and Ferdinand, at length made a compromise. The agreement was that John should retain the kingdom during his life, and that upon his decease, Ferdinand, if he survived him, should take possession. After this compact was formed, there was peace in the country until the death of John, which occurred in the year 1540, when he was carried off by a fever. During these years he abstained from persecuting the Protestants, either because he was desirous of quiet, or because the disturbed state of affairs in Transylvania occupied his attention. In this interval of peace, the reformation struck its roots deep in Hungary, and was widely extended by the evangelical labours of many eminent men. Among these none holds a more distinguished place than John Honter, a native of Corona, in Transylvania. This man was, at the same time, a rhetorician, a philosopher, and celebrated mathematician. His elementary education was obtained at Cracow, in Poland, but he went afterwards to Basel, to which place he was attracted by the fame of Reuchlin and other eminent professors at that university. Having finished his education, he returned to his own country, in the year 1533, where he applied himself vigorously to the promotion of the reformation which had there been begun. To promote this object, he introduced, at his own expense, the typographical art, and hired skilful printers, by whose instrumentality he published, in the vernacular tongue, a number of valuable works, suited to enlighten the minds and soften the dispositions of his countrymen. And, by degrees, he became more bold, and ventured to edit several of the writings of Luther; particularly "the Augsburg Confession." He also published a number of small works containing evangelical doctrine, by means of which the reformation was rapidly extended; for, before his time, no books of this kind



were circulated in Hungary, but a few brought from Germany, and procured at a very high price.

The senate of Cronstat was so impressed with the talents and worth of Honter, that they committed the whole business of religion into his hands: and he having associated with himself Matthias Calvin, a man distinguished for his courage and for his knowledge of the reformed doctrines; and excelling in the faculty of extemporaneous speaking; by whose aid he exerted all his influence to expel Popery from his native city. He also had the co-operation of Valentine Wagner, a man distinguished for his knowledge of the Greek language, and John Fuchsius, the chief magistrate of Cronstat, a man estimable for his integrity of life and purity of morals. A book, in which the true principles of the doctrines of the reformation were set forth, was published, and all were encouraged to read it. A most desirable success attended these efforts, so that in a short time, the whole province of Barcia was brought over to embrace the Lutheran doctrines; and in the year 1542, private masses were abolished, and the communion was administered to the people in both kinds.

After the death of king John, his widow refused to give up the kingdom of Hungary to Ferdinand, agreeably to the compact entered into with him by her husband. Upon which Ferdinand attempted to gain possession by force; but this ambitious woman had the imprudence to apply to Solyman, the grand Seignior, for assistance. This tyrant was well pleased with the opportunity of introducing an army into Hungary. He marched against the forces of Ferdinand, and defeated them entirely. But the widow of John reaped the just reward of her temerity; for, instead of putting her in possession of the kingdom, the Turks held it themselves, and she was obliged to seek her own safety by retiring into Transylvania, where she not a little obstructed the progress of evangelical doctrine.

In the year 1543, by the instigation of Martinusius, a general convention was called to meet at Clausenburg, to consult about the affairs of the kingdom of Transylvania, and also to take measures to settle upon a right footing the business of religion. John Honter, and other leading reformers of Corona, were summoned to attend this convention. And great fears were entertained by many that the design was to proceed against them, and bring them to the stake, as had been done in the case of George Varadinus. It was therefore determined that John Honter should be left at home, and that,

in his place, John Fuchsius, accompanied by a judge and two senators, and Matthias Calvin, should attend, relying on the protection of God. And that with these, Jeremiah Jokelius and Nicholas Stephens, pastors of the reformed churches of Cronstat, should also be commissioned to render an account of the grounds and reasons of the reformed religion; and to intercede with the queen for liberty to enjoy its public exercise. When all had convened, Martinusius, in order that he might give evidence of the sincerity of his attachment to the faith of Rome, and maintain the authority of that ecclesiastical court, demanded that the Lutheran doctors should be led forth to be burned at the stake; but several of the most distinguished councillors of the queen opposed this motion, and declared, that before any thing was done, or any punishment inflicted, a conference should be held between the parties. In this conference the Lutheran doctors made their appeal entirely to the holy scriptures, from the testimonies of which they demonstrated the truth of their doctrines; while their adversaries had recourse to the fathers, to councils, and to traditions, and endeavoured to expose the scriptural arguments to reproach. The night after these transactions, the Lutherans were called in, and by promises and threats, were earnestly solicited to embrace the Popish religion. But their stability could not be shaken. They declared that it was their fixed purpose to hold fast the truth which they had confessed. Martinusius still urged that these men should be treated as heretics, and would have prevailed, had it not been for the opposition of the councillors, before mentioned, who advised them to return to their own places. Thus, while an opportunity was afforded to expose the futile arguments of the defenders of Popery, and to exhibit the pure doctrines of the reformation, under the guardianship of God, they were permitted to return to Corona uninjured. But the effect of this conference on the minds of the nobles who were present, was favourable to the cause of the reformation; for not a few of them were convinced that the dogmas of the Papists were trifling and without evidence, and they could not but see that the Lutheran religion was sustained by the undoubted testimonies of scripture. The success of the reformation in this region now far exceeded the expectations of most. Several learned men renounced the Popish religion and joined themselves to the reformers. Among these was Ægidius, who, with an extraordinary candour, as soon as he became acquainted with the doctrines of a purer reli-



gion, with the utmost zeal and diligence proceeded to instil them into the minds of his hearers. But it would be tedious to name all who were active in promoting the reformation during this period; and Martinusius was under the necessity of being a witness of the progress of that cause which he hated, but was unable to obstruct. In the year 1545, the whole country around Corona had come over to the reformed religion. And as many Greeks visited Corona, and often took up their residence there, Wagner undertook to prepare a catechism, in the Greek language, for their use, containing a concise summary of the doctrines of the reformation. When this was printed and published, it called forth the highest expressions of approbation from the favourers of the reformation in Germany, and particularly from the professors at Wittenberg.

In the year 1545 several synods were convened in Hungary, at one of which it was agreed by the reformers to adopt entire the Augsburg Confession, and to use the ceremonies as practised in Saxony. But the other synod which met this year, consisting of twenty-nine reformed pastors, judged it expedient to draw up a confession of their own faith, which was comprehended in twelve articles.

Martinusius was exceedingly chagrined to observe the rapid progress of the Protestant religion in Hungary and Transylvania; and especially to see that synods were called and transacted their business openly without fear. This state of things was owing to the patronage afforded to the reformers by several of the most powerful among the nobles; the chief of whom was Urban Batjani, who disconcerted and rendered ineffectual all the hostile designs of the monks. This man was of one of the most ancient and honourable families of the race of the Huns, who was respected for his incorruptible integrity, his solid learning, and his unshaken loyalty to the queen. But as he stood very much in the way of the wicked designs of the monks, it was resolved to take him off by poison, which one of his own domestics was hired to administer. And this wicked act was followed up by the persecution of several of the reformed pastors. This persecution was especially directed against some excellent ministers who had translated several books of the holy scriptures into the vernacular tongue of Hungary.

In the year 1549, this unhappy country fell under the government of Ferdinand again, who had now become emperor. Although he was disposed to gratify the monks, and connived

at their persecution of the evangelical ministers, yet he was also much influenced by the nobles of the country, who took pains to soothe his mind, and thus he was led to pursue a course somewhat moderate towards the Protestants.

In this year a large synod of reformed pastors convened at Thorn, where they agreed upon thirteen articles of religion. But although this synod was numerously attended, it remains uncertain where they met; for there were several towns very similar in their names. Lampe has bestowed more attention on this point than to us it seems to deserve. After a learned discussion, he comes to the conclusion that the place called Torna, in the records of the times, was no other than Temesvar, where the famous reformer Szegedinus was pastor. The following year it seems another synod met at the same place, in which rules were adopted to regulate the bishops or superintendents in the visitation of the churches.

As we have given the character of two eminent reformers in Hungary, Matthias Devai and John Honter, it will now be proper to give some account of a third, Stephen Szegedinus, whose name has been just mentioned. This man was an eminent promoter of the pure doctrines of the gospel, and deserves to be particularly commemorated for maintaining a sound doctrine respecting the sacrament of the Lord's supper. The celebrated Hulderick speaks of him in the following terms: "Should I not grieve for the departure of that venerable old man, Szegedinus, worthy of the apostolic age? Such was the piety, the gravity, and the prudence of this man, in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs, that he was exceedingly profitable to the great Luther and holy Melancthon when he lived with them, in the management of the most important concerns. When I was a boy, he was the second person who pointed out the corruptions prevalent in regard to the sacred supper, and by his influence almost entirely removed it from the churches in this land. His skill in divine things was equal to his polish in human literature. I have often heard my revered preceptor, Paul Thuxius, call him 'another Cicero.' From the school over which he presided issued almost as many champions as from the Trojan horse, whose influence and labours in our churches have been most salutary. But, alas, the churches, thirty-four in number, over which he was superintendent, were desolated by the invasion of the barbarous Turks; and he was cast into prison, whence, after remaining two years, he was redeemed by the payment of a great sum by the churches." Queensted,



in his account of illustrious men, mentions Szegedinus, and says, that he derived his name from his country, and was a zealous defender of Christianity against the Arians, Moham-medans, and other pernicious sectaries, but was addicted to the Calvinian party."

Although the first Protestant churches in Hungary were constituted on the Saxon platform and adopted the Augsburg Confession, yet from the middle of the century, the Helvetic or Geneva creed obtained many followers, and had increasing prevalence in the kingdom of Hungary. This appears very evident from the letters of John Reyert Hoy, secretary to the chancellor of Hungary, in the year 1551, addressed to the celebrated Bullinger, which Hulderick has preserved. A specimen from one of these is as follows: "Although you are unknown to me by face, yet by your writings, and the spirit which breathes in them, you seem to be perfectly known; for whenever I peruse your writings (which I do, day and night, to discipline my mind to the standard of the Christian religion), I seem to myself to be conversing with you. For, all flattery aside, to your learned writings, above those of other authors, this our Hungarian nation, so oppressed by the worship of idols and by the tyranny of the Turks, has been reformed from innumerable superstitions, and recalled to the true rule of the Christian religion. For this blessed reformation we feel ourselves, under God, more indebted to you than to any other person. By this means the pious have been confirmed in sound doctrine which they had not before heard, not only in these parts of Hungary now under the power of the Turks, but even in Thrace, and as far as Constantinople, the pure gospel is preached, and the afflicted hearts of dispersed Christians have been filled with consolation; which thing seems to afford some indication of the fulfilment of Christ's prediction, that in the last days his gospel should be preached throughout the whole world. Therefore, in the name of the Hungarian churches, I give you thanks for the rich benefits conferred upon us by your writings; and if the distance which separates us was not so great, you should understand, in some degree, the warmth of our gratitude towards you."

The same thing is evident from the letters of other distinguished men in Hungary, addressed also to Henry Bullinger. An extract from one of these is as follows: "The gospel is preached every where, through the whole of Hungary, not however without opposition from the Popish priests and

bishops; but in Turkey the truth is permitted to be freely published. In Transylvania there are pious and learned men, skilled in the tongues, who have prepared and circulated catechisms among the Greeks, Thracians, and Lithuanians, in their own languages. And it is said, that in Turkey, many Turks mingle in the assemblies of Christians, and hear their discourses; whence it may be readily conjectured, that unless they are speedily destroyed, they will in a short time embrace the Christian faith. And it is a thing surprising, and worthy of particular observation, that in the numerous controversies which take place between the reformed pastors and the Papists, in the presence of the Turkish prefects and courts, their judgment is always given in favour of our cause. The enclosed letter from Michael Starinus, who has been a preacher of the word of God in the town of Lazko, which, for fifteen years, has been in the possession of the Turks, will furnish you with an interesting account of the preservation of the Christian church under Turkish tyranny."

The letter referred to is as follows: "Seven years have now elapsed since, by the will of the supreme and infinite God, I have lived under the dominion of the Turks, in Lower Baronia, where I have not only been the first, but the sole minister of the word in the town of Lazko, which is about one Hungarian mile from Ezek. Here I commenced preaching the gospel, and with the aid of some brethren, who afterwards entered into these fields white for the harvest, by the influence of the Holy Spirit, I built up one hundred and twenty churches, on both sides of the Danube and of the Drave. In all these the pure word of God has been preached, and most cordially and unanimously received; so that many who have seen these churches have declared, that they have never observed any churches better instructed, even among those who have enjoyed the gospel for more than thirty years. For this blessed work we attribute no praise to ourselves; but ascribe the whole to the power of God. 'It is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes,' that the stone Christ rejected not only by the Hungarians, but by all nations, should thus be constituted the *head* of this part of Hungary, groaning as it is under Turkish oppression, and destitute of all help from other nations. Our thanks are due to God, who, in the midst of our servitude, has granted us liberty, and for our degradation hath bestowed upon us nobility, and while suffering under the conquest of our enemies, has given us the victory over death and hell. For when in this world



we are judged and corrected of the Lord, it is that we may not be condemned with the world. As David sings, 'It is good for me that I have been afflicted, that I might learn thy statutes.'

"It would be tedious, my very dear Nicholas, to tell you of all the severe conflicts which for seven years we have had with the Popish priests, whilst we have been preaching the word of God. Let it suffice to say, that every where we have come off victorious in these contests, and have succeeded in driving them as wolves from the sheepfold of Christ. Some of them have taken refuge beyond the river Titius; others beyond the Save, and some even among the Sarmatians, beyond the snowy Caucasus. In this very year, at the meeting of our synod at Vulcovar, during the feast of the Passover, we overcame them in two battles; and some of them were driven, through fear, to hide themselves in a large basket, on which, to conceal them, three women took their seats. This circumstance gave rise to a Hungarian proverb. *Popge pad coriton pad Troyám senom.*"

The extraordinary success of Michael Starinus in that part of Hungary called Lower Baronia, is fully attested by the ecclesiastical historians of that time. It is stated that in a short time many of the priests and monks renounced Popery, and resigned their parishes into the hands of Starinus.

Another distinguished Hungarian reformer deserves especially to be mentioned and remembered, because he suffered martyrdom, attesting the truth which he preached with his own blood. This was Basilus Radan.

In the year 1552, a synod was held, in which an article concerning the Lord's supper, agreed upon at the former synod, was enlarged and strengthened. This was judged expedient because there were still some pastors who held the doctrine of consubstantiation. A second article related to auricular confession, which was condemned; and public confessions sanctioned. In the third place, the subject of altars in churches was discussed, and it was determined that where they had already been removed from the churches they should not be restored; but where they existed they might remain, and be used as a table for the administration of the sacred supper.

A fourth subject which engaged the attention of this synod was the support of pastors; especially where there were no patrons, and the people few.

The flourishing state of the Hungarian churches, about the

middle of the sixteenth century, may be learned from letters to Edward VI. from the celebrated Martin Bucer, and Paul Fagius, which have been preserved by Thuanus in his history. In a letter of Bucer, dated 1549, he writes as follows: "In Hungary, glory be to God, there now exists not a small number of churches, which, together with the pure doctrine of Christ, have also received a sound system of discipline, which they religiously observe. May our king Christ bring it about, that very many may follow the example of these churches."

Szegedinus, of whom we have already spoken, having been driven from his home, went ultimately to Torna, where he greatly aided that eminent man Michael Starinus, both by his counsels and his labours.

Unpleasant disputes, about 1554, arose in Hungary, between the Lutherans and Calvinists, respecting the Lord's supper. We have mentioned one synod in which the Helvetic doctrine was avowed; we will now mention, that a synod was convened in a town called Ovarinum, consisting of eighty-nine pastors, in which Hanerus asserts that the Lutheran doctrine was confirmed; but Lampe says, that the acts of this synod are lost, and does not admit the correctness of the above statement; because the church of Ovarinum favoured the reformed doctrine, and it was situated within the jurisdiction of Drafgius, who was an eminent patron of the Calvinistic pastors.

The first who enkindled the flames of contention between these two bodies of Protestants was Francis Stancar, who, in 1553, began to disturb the churches of Hungary; but his designs being detected and frustrated, he went to Transylvania, where he propagated his impious doctrine, that Christ was mediator in his human nature only, and that the divine nature contributed nothing to the mediatorial office. And, moreover, that Christ had become our justifying righteousness, in his human nature alone, and not at all in his divine nature. In opposition to this erroneous opinion of Stancar, a confession was drawn up by Caspar Heltus, and adopted at Claudiopilis. This turbulent man happening to agree with the reformed on the subject of the sacred supper, and having manifested an intemperate zeal in its defence, his erroneous opinions on the points before mentioned were attributed to them also, but most unjustly; for they were opposed and refuted by none with more earnestness and ability than by Calvin and his followers. And how little he cared for any



of the reformers, and especially for Calvin, may be learned from his famous declaration, "that Peter Lombard, alone, was worth a hundred Luthers, two hundred Melancthons, three hundred Bullingers, four hundred Martyrs, and five hundred Calvins." Ferdinand, the emperor, who was also king of Hungary, in the year 1555, granted the free exercise of religion to five cities of Upper Hungary, namely Cassovia, Bartpha, Epperjessium, Leutschovia and Cibinium. This religious liberty was exceedingly favourable to the progress of the reformed religion in all that region.

The following year (1556) is principally famous for the irruption of the Anabaptists into Hungary. Having been expelled from Germany, multitudes of this fanatical sect came into this country, and as every where else, created much confusion. As early as 1549, a decree had been passed by the royal diet at Posnia against these deluded people; which decree was now renewed in 1556. By this it was provided, that all Anabaptists should, within the space of four weeks, be ejected from the country; an exception, however, was made in favour of some mechanics in the employ of the nobles.

The reformation in some towns of Hungary was universal, and included all the inhabitants, of all ranks. This was especially the fact in regard to Huztinum. The gospel was first preached here by Thomas Hustinas, who was settled in another part of the country, but coming to this place to visit his parents, he lost no opportunity of preaching to the people the pure doctrines of the reformation. Often he taught the people in assemblies convened in private houses, and in the night. But by the wrath of the monks he was expelled from the place; yet he did not desist from his efforts, but in several neighbouring towns he faithfully proclaimed the gospel, and not without fruit. This preacher was attached to the Lutheran church; but in 1556, this place was visited by a reformed minister by the name of Paulus, who instructed the people in the tenets of the reformed church, to which they afterwards firmly adhered.

About the year 1557 or 1558 a synod met at Tzengerina, which is famous in the ecclesiastical history of Hungary, on account of a confession of faith agreed upon, consisting of 92 articles, which was published at Geneva in 1612, in the *Collection of Confessions*, and by this means was widely extended, and read by many nations; and may still be seen by those who are curious to know precisely what was believed by the Hungarian churches.

The controversy which had arisen between the Lutherans and reformed, about this time became very hot; so that a synod was held at Claudiopilis, for the purpose of censuring some of the most eminent of the reformed ministers, who were now stigmatized by the name of *Sacramentarians*. Martin Kalmanshi, a leader among the reformed, was expected to attend at this synod, to dispute with the Lutheran doctors; but his attendance was prevented by indisposition. His adversaries asserted that his sickness was feigned, and proceeded to condemn him being absent; and then drew up a confession respecting the sacred supper in conformity with the doctrine of Wittenberg, and all the pastors in Transylvania were required to receive this doctrine, and to avoid all innovations.

The breach between the Lutherans and Calvinists grew wider every day. At a synod which convened at Cibinium, severe measures were taken against those who refused to accede to the Saxon formularies and ceremonies. One of the articles agreed upon was, "That all the errors of the Nestorians, Sacramentarians, of Wickliff, of Berengarius, of Carolstadt, of Zuingle, of Oecolampadius, of Calvin, &c. are condemned."

It was also decreed, that the form of absolution in the sacraments, observed at Wittenberg, should be preserved, and that the priest in administering it should be clothed in a white surplice, in imitation of the primitive church, and of the angels standing before the throne of the lamb, who are thus habited.

It was also determined in this synod, that private absolution should be retained, that while fabulous paintings should be removed from the churches, the historical should remain. And that the ceremonies and festivals of the Saxon churches should be observed.

But we cannot give a better view of the Hungarian churches at this time, than by laying before the reader, a letter of Gallus Hussar to Henry Bullinger.

"Excellent Pastor—I have many things which I could wish to say to you, both relating to myself and the public; but I must be content to confine my epistle to the state of the church of Christ in these regions, which he hath purchased with his own blood. You are not ignorant how greatly our churches have been afflicted for many years, in this most unhappy kingdom. He who can look upon the disconsolate face of our ecclesiastical affairs, and not be moved to groans and tears must have a heart of iron. For a long time the Turks



have had possession of Buda our metropolis, whence they send out marauding parties into every corner of the land, who lay waste and depopulate the country. A great multitude of virgins, boys, wives, &c. are driven away like cattle to be sold into vile and perpetual slavery. It is heart-rending to witness the miserable parents deprived of their dearly beloved offspring, who are forcibly carried into foreign countries, where they can never hope to see their faces again. And the most chaste virgins and matrons are given up into the hands of ruthless and cruel soldiers. How distressing to see such persons bound round the neck with chains, or cords; brought to the slave-market (called in Turkish *hardey*), and there led about and offered for sale! On which occasions, these delicate females are subjected to the most mortifying examinations and exposures; for the barbarous and unfeeling buyers will not be satisfied without denuding almost every part of the body, to see whether there is any thing faulty in the persons exposed to sale. These things cannot but be horrible to the contemplation of pious minds. And this is not all, for many are wantonly butchered by their cruel tyrants. But our troubles do not proceed alone from the Turks. The Roman antichrist rages against the pure doctrines and faithful ministers of the gospel; especially, in those places which have not fallen under the dominion of the Turk. For strange as it may appear—and undoubtedly it has been so ordered by providence in favour of his church—the Turks have exercised kindness towards our ministers, and oppose no obstacle in the way of their pastoral labours. Indeed, we often see troops of them coming to our religious assemblies, who listen attentively to the sermon preached; but as soon as they see a preparation for the celebration of the Lord's supper, they depart. But the treatment which our ministers experience from the dignitaries of the papal church is far different; of which you will be convinced when I relate to you a single fact. Nicholas Walchius, archbishop of Strigonia, and high chancellor of Ferdinand in Hungary, cast into prison three ministers of the churches of Posen. Two of these, to obtain their release, publicly from the pulpit abjured the doctrines of the reformation. The third continued firm to his principles, and was retained in prison. But mark the result. One of those who had renounced his faith, when he returned home was preparing to celebrate his nuptials with a virtuous young woman, to whom he had been espoused, be-

fore his imprisonment: but in less than a week after his release and abjuration he was so filled with remorse that he fell sick and died in the most miserable agony, but refusing to open his mouth to speak any thing. The other appeared like one deprived of reason, stupidly wandered about through towns and villages; and continues the same vagrant life unto this time. I mention these facts that your church, which feels solicitude for us, may by their assiduous prayers obtain for our afflicted and persecuted churches a more prosperous state. But one end of my writing is to obtain from you an opinion respecting some cases of discipline which have arisen out of the peculiar condition of our churches. It has frequently occurred, that during the devastation of our country and captivity of our people, husbands and wives have been torn asunder. The wife, for example, has been carried away into some distant land and sold as a slave, while the husband, utterly ignorant of her place, or whether she is dead or alive, is left among us. In these circumstances it has not been judged wrong for him, after waiting a reasonable time, to marry again. This has often been done, and children have been the fruit of this second marriage. But in several instances, the captive wife after years of exile has by some means obtained her liberty and returned home. Here then is the difficulty. Which of the two is the lawful wife of the husband? In some instances, the man has preferred his first wife and has relinquished the second; but the reverse has happened in other instances; for having had children by the second, and not by the first, his affections have cleaved to the mother of his children. And some have assigned as a reason for adhering to the second in preference of the first, that females under the power of arbitrary lords, are subject to defilement, and therefore they were unwilling to receive such to their bed and bosom. We know, indeed, what the canon determines in such cases: but this has not proved adequate to satisfy our consciences in a case of so much perplexity. The church of Christ has never given countenance to bigamy, and we are exceedingly perplexed to know what judgment to form in a case of so doubtful a nature; and would be much gratified, if you could convene a synod composed of the most judicious theologians in your vicinity, and let our churches know their views of duty in relation to this vexed subject. We confide this whole matter to your pious zeal and sound discretion; believing that you feel so deep an in-



terest in the good order and purity of our churches, that you will omit nothing which will have a tendency to promote these objects.

“Another subject on which I wish to communicate with you, is the state of our churches in Hungary as it relates to rites and ceremonies in conducting divine worship. Any one may readily conjecture that, in the perturbed state of our affairs, confusion must have arisen. This is the fact; so that in regard to these matters, it may be said, that every one has done what appeared right in his own eyes. And although, throughout Hungary, the churches are harmonious in receiving the same confession of faith—for the Romish tyranny is nearly extinct among us—yet in the mode of administering the sacraments, and conducting divine worship, there is much disparity, and this has had a tendency to diminish a respect for the ministry among the common people. In our doctrinal opinions we are generally disposed to be followers of yourself, and John Calvin, as in your writings you have exhibited your views. What we seem to want is, a catechism which shall prescribe some uniform mode of conducting the singing, prayers, administration of the Lord’s supper, baptism, confirmation, and the solemnization of marriage. A directory for public worship, drawn up by some pious and judicious theologian, would undoubtedly prove a great blessing to our churches. And such a work, coming from your pen, would have great weight among us, since your writings are so universally acceptable, that if you should prepare for us a catechism of the kind mentioned, no one, it may be presumed, would any longer follow his own crude conceptions, so as to disturb the uniformity of worship by using ceremonies different from those commonly in use in the churches.

“As you probably have influence with Philip Melancthon, it would certainly be expedient to exhort him openly and candidly, to declare his opinion respecting the sacrament of the eucharist; for his dissimulation on this point, has brought not a small evil on the church of Christ.

“Other things I would wish to write, but for further particulars I must refer you to Henry Bullinger, jr., your son, a young man of excellent talents and disposition, who will verbally communicate many things from me. Whatever you may be pleased to write in answer, let it be addressed to the care of Raphaël Hofhatter, printer in Vienna, who will have it conveyed to me.

“The brethren of our churches salute you, and beg an inte-

rest in your prayers. Farewell, and excuse the inclegance of my style."

Stancar continued to give new evidence of his turbulent spirit. This year (1558) he addressed letters to the widow of the late king, and to the nobles of Transylvania, urging upon them the duty of extirpating heretics from the land by the sword; and specially named Caspar Heltus, Francis Davidis, and Matthias Gebler, who, he said, had declared war against the Son of God and the Holy Spirit. He insisted that God had given it in charge to all kings and princes, and, indeed, to all men, to defend his truth according to the testimony of the holy scriptures; and that when heretics were convicted, they ought to be cut off by the sword. It was, he alleged, a matter of divine right, and fully established by the canon law, that all heretics should be burnt; and that the civil law required and demanded that their goods should be confiscated, and the proceeds placed in the public treasury.

The calumnies of this man were so loudly and constantly vociferated, that an apology or defence of the clergy of Transylvania was drawn up by order of a synod convened at Claudiopolis, in which the proceedings of the conference with Stancar, held the preceding year, were recited: and it was shown, that the ministers of the churches taught in strict accordance with the prophetic and apostolic doctrine; and a modest refutation of his calumnies was annexed.

In this year Philip Melanethon transmitted to the churches of Transylvania, a writing, containing his views of the controversy respecting the supper of our Lord. And the synod of Torda, after passing some resolutions against Stancar, proceeded to censure all who with Kalmanshius, denied the true, real, and substantial presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's supper. This controversy was now carried on with increasing zeal; so that in 1559, a public disputation was held in the city of Medias, between the adherents of the respective confessions of Saxony and Switzerland. The disputants on the part of the Lutherans were Matthias Hebler, superintendent of the churches of Transylvania, and Dyonysius Milius; and on the part of the Calvinists, Caspar Heltus and Francis Davidis. As is usual in such cases, both parties claimed the victory. Another meeting was convened at the same place in the beginning of the year 1560, by prince John, the son of queen Isabella, who was now dead. He brought the parties together, to see if some plan of concord could not be agreed upon. The result was the reverse of his hopes and



wishes: for after many day's discussion, when the Calvinistic ministers continued firmly to adhere to their former opinions, they were cast out by the majority of the synod who adhered to Luther's opinion respecting the sacrament. About this time the churches of Hungary were also disturbed with a dispute respecting the deep and mysterious doctrine of predestination. A synod was held on this account, in 1561, in Transylvania, at which Stephen Kopatz, a distinguished leader among the reformed presided, and by whose wise councils and conciliatory measures, peace was restored, after the contending parties had frequently met in mutual conference, and fully explained their respective views. In the year 1562, a remarkable event occurred in the city and valley of Agrina. The whole garrison, consisting of cavalry and infantry, and all the inhabitants of every rank, entered into a solemn oath to keep the covenant of God. This is the only fact in ecclesiastical history which has a near resemblance to the solemn covenanting which afterwards took place in Scotland and England. A Catholic confession of faith was also agreed upon at this time, to be presented to Ferdinand I., and to his son Maximilian II. This confession comprehended the principal articles of the Christian religion, and was subscribed by all the nobles, by the whole army stationed in that region, and by all the inhabitants. The churches of the city of Debrecin and the surrounding country, also subscribed this confession. This extraordinary zeal for reformation was very much owing to the preaching and influence of one man, Valentinus Hellopæus Sziskai, pastor of the reformed church of Agrina for seven years, but afterwards translated to the city of Debrecin. By numerous small works intended to explain and inculcate the pure doctrines of the reformation, he became very much celebrated among the reformed churches in Hungary. He was a very dear friend of Theodore Beza, minister of Genève.

The above solemn covenanting transaction was by the monks so misrepresented to Ferdinand, that he was led to believe that the reformed had entered into a conspiracy against his authority: whereupon he sent commissioners into Hungary to denounce against these peaceable churches his heavy displeasure. But these pious and intrepid men soon explained their proceedings so as to purge themselves from all suspicion of entertaining any treasonable designs against the government. The paper which they drew up and presented to the emperor's commissioners is still preserved, and

may be seen in Lampe. From this time the doctrines of the reformed, according to the Helvetic confession, made rapid progress, both in Hungary and Transylvania.

In the year 1564, Maxamilian II. who now reigned over Hungary, granted the free exercise of the Protestant religion, according to the confession of Augsburg, to the people of the mining districts in the mountains. In this year also a general synod was convened at Enjedinum, a town of Transylvania, to which king John II. sent the famous George Blaudrata, with full authority to act in his name, and to put the synod in mind of the importance of choosing a superintendent from the Saxon, and another from the Hungarian nation; and also to admonish them to adopt some measures of peace and reconciliation respecting the sacred supper. The letter which king John addressed to the synod is also preserved by Lampe in his *History of the Hungarian Churches* (p. 123), and is weighty in its sentiments and conciliatory in its spirit. He represents strongly the evils to the churches from perpetual controversy; urges the appointment of a superintendent for each party for the purpose of preventing these disgraceful altercations.

It is recorded by the historians of that time, that pope Pius V. granted to the Catholics of Hungary and Transylvania permission to receive the sacrament of the Lord's supper in both kinds.

In the year 1566, a copy of the Geneva Confession of Faith was sent by Theodore Beza into Hungary, which was immediately adopted and subscribed by almost all the reformed churches in Hungary, on this side the river Theiss (Tibescus). In two synods this confession was approved, and it was enjoined upon the ministers "to study this formula with care, and to make themselves well acquainted with it; not because it was the work of Theodore Beza, but because it was accordant with the sacred scriptures."

It may be proper here to remark, that the Helvetic Confession, drawn up by Bullinger, Myconius, and Grynæus, and then transmitted for approbation to Capito and Bucer at Strasburg, and also to the professors at Wittenberg, in the year 1566, for important reasons, underwent a revision, and was much enlarged, and many things more accurately explained. This confession, thus amended, was subscribed by all the ministers of Switzerland and Geneva; and the same was approved by the churches of England, of Scotland, of Belgium, of Poland, and also of Hungary. It was also ap-

proved by many churches in Germany. All which is evident from the preface to the "Collection of Confessions." It was reprinted at Debretzin, in Hungary, with some additional articles, and presented to king John II. in 1567. Henceforward this became the uniform and established confession of the Hungarian churches, and continued to be subscribed by all the reformed ministers, without exception.

At first, the Hungarian churches used the catechism composed by John Calvin. Afterwards, several eminent men composed brief catechisms in the Hungarian idiom, which were much approved, and were very useful. But when, in 1563, the Heidelberg or Palatinate catechism came into Hungary, which had been composed by Ursinus and Olivian, ministers of Heidelberg, it was received into common use, as soon as it was translated into the language of the country. Indeed, no catechism has been so widely diffused as this. It was adopted by all the reformed churches in Germany, Holland, Switzerland, &c., and has been translated into Belgic, English, Saxon, French, Italian, Bohemian, Slavonic, Greek, and even into Hebrew. Although the Heidelberg catechism was now universally adopted by the reformed churches of Hungary, it was not the only one in use; two smaller works, adapted to children of a tender age, were also extensively used. From the above statement it will be evident that the reformed churches in Hungary were, in doctrine, in perfect agreement with the reformed churches in Germany, Switzerland, Geneva, Holland—and, indeed, throughout the world the reformed churches held and professed the very same doctrines, at this period.

A greater affliction befel the reformed churches of Hungary now, than any external oppression of either Turks or Papists. This was the declension of some leading men into Arian and Sabellian errors. George Blandrata, who had manifested his partiality for anti-trinitarian errors while resident in Geneva, was now the leader in the propagation of heresy. And having ingratiated himself fully into the favour of the young king of Transylvania, John II., to whom he was appointed physician, he acquired an unbounded influence in Transylvania, both in civil and ecclesiastical affairs. The other person who disturbed the churches by avowing heretical opinions respecting the sacred Trinity, was Francis Davidis, pastor of the church at Clausenburg. In the years 1566, 1567, and 1568, frequent synods were convened to



consider, and to endeavour to suppress these dangerous opinions. Lucas Agriensis also, gave much trouble to the churches, by his impious and heretical opinions, which he defended with obstinacy. The synod of Gontz met January 22, 1566, and agreed upon twenty-two articles relating to doctrine and discipline. They also addressed a pastoral letter to the churches containing much good and seasonable advice. The opinions of Lucas Agriensis, adverse to the divinity of Christ, were considered and refuted in this synod. Caspar Karoli exhibited an able answer to the thesis of Lucas, to which he returned an answer in writing, both of which are preserved by Prof. Lampe. In March of the same year, a synod met in Transylvania, to consider the bold errors propagated by Blandrata and Davidis. This synod also drew up a number of articles relative to the doctrine of the Trinity, which were widely circulated. But these heretics had long been concocting their errors, and secretly poisoning the minds of many, and the decrees of the synod had little effect on them. Besides these synodical meetings, others for disputation were instituted, where the advocates of the opposing opinions discussed this mysterious subject for many successive days. One of these was held at Weissenburg in 1568, where the disputation lasted ten days. The principal opposer of the orthodox doctrine was Francis Davidis, who, however, had George Blandrata at his right hand. This meeting took place in one of the rooms of the palace, and the king was present through the whole, and also the principal nobility of the country. The synod met this year at Szeksovia and adopted twenty-four orthodox articles.

Another synod met at Cassovia, where the errors of Lucas Agriensis again were brought under consideration, and twenty-seven articles were agreed upon in opposition to these errors; but the result was as before, he published an answer to the articles of the synod, and persisted in his errors. To this paper a replication was made in behalf of the synod; and they published also a confession of their faith in regard to this fundamental article of religion.

The number of ministers who subscribed the orthodox confession of the synod of Cassovia, against the errors of Lucas Agriensis and Francis Davidis, was forty-five. Lampe has preserved their names, and not only the articles agreed upon by the synod, but the answers of the persons accused, and the replication of the synod to these answers. This may be as good an opportunity as we shall have of mentioning the

gratifying fact, that Lucas Agriensis, before mentioned, in process of time, that is, after fifteen or sixteen years, renounced his errors, and addressed to the churches which he had troubled and offended, an orthodox confession of his faith. At the time, he seems to have been an exile, and in a state of captivity; but we are unacquainted with the circumstances which led to this condition. The following is an extract from this paper, "I believe in and confess one true and eternal God, existing in one undivided essence, but in three persons, or eternal hypostases, peculiar to the divine nature alone, that is *ἑμουνσίοις*, possessing one and the same divine essence, neither separated nor separable, as in the persons of men and angels, in which there is a multiplicity; but distinguished by certain personal properties, peculiar to each. The Father is eternal; the Son is co-eternal with the Father; and the Holy Spirit, in like manner co-eternal. The Father is uncreated, unbegotten, and not existing by or from another, who from eternity in an ineffable manner generated the only begotten Son, the *λογος*, from his own substance. Moreover, the Son of God, and only begotten of the Father, as John testifies, is truly God, 'for the *λογος* was God;' and was not created out of nothing, as Arius blasphemously said; but was begotten of the Father before all ages, by whom all things were made, and who became a man for us; so that he is true God and true man, in one person, the Mediator, Redeemer, and Saviour of men. Finally, the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father and the Son, and is co-eternal with them, and was sent by the Son to sanctify the church. These three Divine Persons, I believe and confess to be the ever blessed Trinity, in whose name Christians are baptized, according to the command of Christ." Under his signature he adds, "now a captive five years." Affliction often brings men to sobriety and humility, so that they throw away their vain speculations, which are the product of pride and unsanctified gifts. The result was very different with regard to Francis Davidis and George Blandrata. These heretics, so far from recanting their errors, went on from bad to worse, and were the cause of more evil to the church than can be calculated.

Bullinger was evidently the reformer who was most admired by the Hungarian churches, and they kept up a brisk correspondence with this eminent pastor. We have already given one letter addressed to him from one of the ministers of Hungary, which contained much intelligence respecting ecclesiastical

affairs in that region. We will now subjoin another, from Matthias Thurius, written in 1568.

“Reverend and illustrious preceptor—I wish to make you acquainted with the most audacious spirit and progress of that most impure man, George Blandrata. How great his success, and that of his Achates, Francis Davidis, in propagating their pestiferous doctrine, I cannot mention without the greatest grief of mind. Of these things I wrote some account to that celebrated man, John Wolf, from which you may learn in how disastrous a state our ecclesiastical affairs now are. From their success in Transylvania, Lucas was emboldened to attempt to disturb our churches in Upper Hungary; but he did not meet with equal encouragement; for our ministers resolutely opposed his designs, and disputed keenly with him for the orthodox faith. . . . May the just Lord manifest his displeasure towards these enemies of his truth! I sincerely wish that what you said once to me in a most delightful conversation which I had with you, may be verified in this case, namely, ‘that no one in any age ever opposed himself to Christ with impunity.’ And when you uttered these words, you informed me, that this same Blandrata, who has proved so great a pest to the church in these parts, had been dismissed from your house. The evils which our unhappy country has suffered from continual wars, for a few years past, cannot be told, but much sorer evils have we endured from the unbridled fury of these heretics. And since they run every where, with equal audacity attacking the majesty of God and the throne of his Son, you, whom God hath appointed the propagators and defenders of his truth, should not endure that they should go on any farther in their impious course with impunity. For, under God, those arms with which we must contend, we must derive from you.—But I will not say more on this subject. I know that you and other of God’s instruments cannot be indifferent witnesses of the grievous evils under which our churches labour. What I wish distinctly to bring before your mind is, that a greater benefit cannot be conferred upon us, than that something should be written which might render us more skilful in our contest with these raging enemies. Finally, I pray God, that for a long time yet he may preserve your person, venerable for age, not only for your own sake, but for the sake of his church.”

The following is an extract of the letter to Wolf, mentioned



in the preceding—"What that most abandoned physician has attempted in Transylvania, I informed you before. I will now let you know what progress he has made. In hither Transylvania, he has infected the minds of almost all with his poison; and I do not believe that even Arius himself, or any other heretic of past ages, ever belched out so many and so great blasphemies against God and against his Son, as this man has done. To give you an example. He has proceeded to such impious audacity, that he has had pictures printed to bring into derision those whom he denominates *anti-christs*. In these, the doctrine of the Trinity is exhibited under the figure of a three-headed Geryon, or three heads united to one body; another of these prints represents Janus with his two faces; and another by a ring in the form of a triangle. . . . Lucas Agriensis, formerly a colleague of Davidis, was detected in his attempts to play the same game among us; but our ministers promptly met him, and contended earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. I sent a copy of his book to our venerated preceptor, Henry Bullinger, which contains also an account of the proceedings against him. Another copy I sent to that highly celebrated man, Theodore Beza. Now when you see the glory of the most high God thus assailed by *these dogs*, you ought to remember in what station in the church you are placed. I pray you not to permit these monsters to rage against the sheep of Christ with impunity. Do try to confirm the churches, many of which are now wavering. The Rev. Josias Simler wrote some things on this controverted subject, which, as we had hoped, conferred important benefits on our churches. Whatever he, or others among you may be able to do, the bleeding condition of our distracted churches demands, in which there are many whose consciences are greatly disturbed by the variety of contending opinions, which are every where tossed about. I beg you, in my name, to salute those very venerable men, your colleagues, Gualter, Simler, Lavater, Haller, Hulderick, Zuingle, and our beloved and highly respected instructors. Farewell."

In the year 1569, Francis Davidis, minister of Clausenburg, and superintendent of the churches in that region, instigated by Blandrata, and by the authority of the young king, John II., summoned the clergy to meet in synod at Varadinum, in the month of October; and in the letter of convocation it was declared, that the object was to consider and discuss the points respecting the Trinity which were in dispute. And

to prepare the way for the discussion of these theological questions, he sent certain propositions to each minister, which expressed his own opinions. These restless men seem to have expected a majority on their side at this synod, or they would not have been so industrious in calling the meeting. But when the ministers of the churches had come together, and had maturely considered the questions submitted to them, they drew up a confession of their faith in entire conformity with the orthodox creed of the reformed churches. The number of ministers in this synod of Varadinum, as we may learn from the list preserved by Lampe, was above sixty. In 1576, a synod of forty ministers met in Lower Hungary, in a town situated between the rivers Save and Drave; but the object of this meeting seems to have been to form rules of order and discipline, and to regulate the manners of the clergy. It was, however, an orthodox synod, as in the first article agreed upon, we have a distinct recognition of the doctrine of the Trinity. Before this time, some of the most eminent ministers of Hungary had been released from their labours; among whom were Stephen Szegedinus and Peter Melius.

From the year 1570 to 1579, nothing remarkable occurred in the churches of Hungary and Transylvania. Blandrata and Davidis spared no pains to disseminate their pestiferous doctrines, which were vigorously opposed by the orthodox ministers of the churches. But in the last mentioned year, a dissension arose between these two heresiarchs, respecting the propriety of offering divine worship to Christ. This Davidis denied, but Blandrata maintained that worship was due to the Son of God. It was agreed to send for Faustus Socinus, from Poland, to be a judge in this controversy. He accordingly came, and was maintained at the expense of Blandrata; but lodged in the house of Davidis from Nov. 1578, till April 1579. But this capricious man, so far from yielding any thing to the arguments of Socinus, went still farther, and maintained that Jesus Christ was no more than a man, and was truly the son of Joseph and Mary; with many other impious opinions. Blandrata and Socinus, fearing that these opinions would be imputed to them and their party, made a representation of the case to the king, who caused Davidis to be put into confinement, where the unhappy man, partly worn out with the agitations of his own mind, and partly by the decays of old age, terminated his life. The state of his mind before his death was that of horror and madness; and

for three days before his end, he did nothing but howl in his distress, seeming to have before him frightful apparitions of demons and spectres.

In the year 1588, when Sigismund Bathori, grandson of Stephen Bathori, king of Poland, was advanced to the throne of Transylvania, the Jesuits, under whose institutions he had been educated, entertained great hopes of recovering their lost influence in the country, and spared no exertions to gain over the king to exert his power in favour of the Catholic religion. With this view they addressed an humble memorial to him, in which they strongly represented the misery of the nation on account of the multitude of discordant and contending sects, by means of which the people were kept in a state of perpetual agitation. To counteract these efforts, the Protestants addressed a long and earnest petition to the king, urging him, by strong considerations, to banish the Jesuits from the country. Finding that the Protestants, though much divided among themselves, were united in opposition to this society, the king, contrary to all his own prejudices and feelings derived from education, published an edict, requiring all Jesuits to depart the country within fifteen days. This caused much joy to the great body of the people to whom these ambitious intriguing men were exceedingly odious.

In the year 1589 an unspeakable benefit was conferred on the whole Hungarian nation by the publication of the holy scriptures in the vernacular tongue of the country. The name of the author of this version of the Bible was Caspar Karoli. He is represented to have been a man of great worth, a very eloquent preacher, and a learned philologist. He was a minister among the Calvinists, and has been much celebrated by those who belonged to this communion.

The controversy concerning the eucharist, although it had greatly disturbed the peace of the Hungarian churches, had not, until about this time, produced a separation of the adherents of the Saxon and Helvetic confessions. The youth of both parties had been in the habit of resorting to Wittenberg to pursue their theological studies; but now the Lutheran theologians became so much embittered against the Calvinists, that some of them made application to the elector to have all students excluded from the university who denied the ubiquity of Christ's body. The instigator of this illiberal measure was that fiery polemic, Ægidius Hunnius. The elector, yielding to the urgent solicitations of the Lu-



theran doctors, directed that all of the above description should be expelled from the university. The consequence was, that twenty-six Hungarian youth, candidates for the ministry, were sent away for not professing to believe in the doctrine of consubstantiation. Lampe has judged it proper to preserve a list of the names of these conscientious students. From this time the youth of the reformed churches in Hungary resorted to Heidelberg instead of Wittenberg; so that henceforth there were very few Hungarian students found at this university.

We have now brought the prosperous part of the history of the reformed churches in Hungary nearly to a termination. For fifteen or twenty years, indeed, there was a quiet and undisturbed state of things, when the churches were well supplied with able and faithful pastors. But about the year 1604, the Jesuits renewed their efforts to regain their former standing and liberty. This they now attempted by means of the authority and influence of Matthias, archduke of Austria, and son of Maximilian II. who revived all the laws and ancient usages in favour of the Roman Catholic religion. The Jesuits being now restored, and being permitted to remain in the country, exerted all their influence to gain a predominance.

In the early part of the seventeenth century that celebrated theologian, David Paræus, had much correspondence with the Hungarian brethren respecting ecclesiastical affairs.

In the year 1620 the Bohemian churches suffered severe persecution under Ferdinand II. The churches of the Protestants were shut up, and their ministers were driven into exile. These severities aroused the Bohemians to open resistance; and a civil war ensued, but it belongs not to our plan to go into any details respecting the churches of Bohemia. We mention the persecution in that country, and the troubles there, because these occasioned a troop of Anabaptists to take refuge in Hungary.

Gabriel Bethlen had succeeded Bathori in the government of Transylvania. He was a patron of the Protestant churches, and promoted their prosperity much; and was induced to lend his aid to the persecuted Bohemian brethren, but without success. This prince died about the year 1630.

It is an unexpected fact in ecclesiastical history, that the dissensions in England between the established church and the Puritans, should have produced an effect on the reformed churches of Hungary. But so it was. It seems probable to

us that the history of this event by Lampe, being altogether derived from documents written by persons unfavourable to the Puritans, is not altogether impartial; but we will give an abstract of his narrative, making ourselves responsible only for the fidelity of our abridgment.

After the Hungarian students, of the reformed religion, had been excluded from the university of Wittenberg, for refusing to acknowledge the doctrine of consubstantiation, they, as has been stated, resorted to the university of Heidelberg. But this seminary being situated in the midst of the scenes of war, the students were scattered and the instructions suspended. The Hungarian students, intent on a thorough theological education, went still farther west, to Groningen and Franeker. At this latter institution, they came under the influence and instructions of the celebrated English theologian, Amesius (Dr. Ames), who had forsaken his native country on account of the persecution of non-conformists, and had taken up his residence in the Low Countries, and was chosen a professor of theology in the above mentioned university. Among the young Hungarians who attended his lectures, there was one of noble birth and aspiring genius, by the name of Tholney. This young man, probably at the suggestion of Amesius, determined to visit England and become acquainted with the Puritans, whose sentiments he had already imbibed. Accordingly he passed over to London, where he lived two years in intimate communion with the non-conformists. And being desirous that their peculiar views and religious customs should be transplanted into his own country, he invited over to England, a number of the Hungarian students, who all became imbued with the spirit of Puritanism. These young men, under the influence of Tholney, now formed an association, the object of which was to promote a more perfect reformation in Hungary, in conformity with the new views which they had imbibed in England. Some of them were sent home to prepare the way for the return of Tholney, their leader. These freely censured many of the existing customs and arrangements of the Hungarian churches, and openly proclaimed the purpose which was formed to attempt to remodel the ecclesiastical constitution of the country; and they observed no moderation in celebrating the praises of Tholney, whom they represented as a very extraordinary man; so that the public expectation in regard to him was greatly excited. This threatened innovation gave much uneasiness and alarm to the ministers of the churches, who im-

mediately took measures to prevent what appeared to them a formidable evil. A synod was convened of the pastors on both sides the river Theiss; which met at the city of Debretzin. Letters were addressed by this synod to all directors of the public schools, to be very cautious in the admission of professors and teachers. And they adopted a resolution, that no student returning from abroad should be received into the ministry in the reformed churches of Hungary, until he underwent a strict examination, and gave full satisfaction to the superintendents of the respective diocesses. And it was also resolved, that every such candidate for the ministry, or for the office of public teacher in the schools, should be required to bind himself by a solemn oath, that he would attempt to introduce no innovations in the doctrines, ceremonies, and government of the churches, unless the same should be agreed upon by a general synod of the country. And, moreover, that if any person, after solemn admonition, should persist in violating the preceding orders, he should, by the civil magistrate, be banished from the country.

After an absence of six years, Tholney returned, and was received by his associates as if he had been an angel from heaven. His first object was to survey the country, and to see with his own eyes the true state of affairs. Accordingly, he travelled over the whole of Hungary and Transylvania; exhibiting every where a great appearance of piety; so that he gained an astonishing influence over the minds of men; and was especially received with great cordiality by laymen and civilians.

The reformed churches had established a famous school at Patak, into the presidency of which Tholney was introduced by the patronage of some leading political men, and with the consent of the prince, within whose jurisdiction this seminary was situated. But the clergy of the district were very unwilling that this aspiring young man, with whose innovating designs they were acquainted, should get possession of so important a school, from which he might, as from a Trojan horse, send forth his emissaries through the whole country. They, therefore, met, and calling Tholney before them, proposed certain conditions which they wished him to subscribe. At first he utterly refused, and treated the proposal with contempt; but when the matter was laid before the prince, and his opinion obtained in favour of the restrictions which the presbytery wished to impose, he submitted, and subscribed every thing which they required, and so was



inducted into this important office. On the occasion, Tholney pronounced an inaugural oration, replete with the keenest satire, and surcharged with calumny and reproaches against the ministers of the reformed churches of Hungary. But when a copy of the oration was demanded, he refused to furnish it.

In a synod which met not long afterwards, he was provoked to engage in public controversy with some of the ministers, in which he departed from all the established rules of disputation, and his discourse degenerated into mere railing.

No sooner had the new principal entered fairly on his office, and commenced his course of instruction, than dissension and confusion arose. Among the students, there was nothing but fierce disputation about the new divinity; and even the directors themselves were split into parties. The consequence was, that animosity and hatred began to pervade the body of the people to such a degree, that it was found necessary to bring the grievances of the church before the prince, and petition to have this man removed from the presidency of the school. After a full consideration of the whole case it was resolved, that Tholney should be removed from his office of principal, and be translated to be the pastor of the church of Miskoltzien. But although peace was now restored to the seminary, this restless man could not be quiet.

Ferdinand III. being now king of Hungary, as well as emperor of Germany, through the influence of the Jesuits and monks, at the diet which met at Presburg in 1638, caused a decree to be published, commanding all Protestant ministers to leave the kingdom of Hungary. By this unexpected persecution they were reduced to the utmost distress; but confiding in the friendly feelings of prince Rakotz, they earnestly supplicated his interposition with the emperor in their behalf. The prince did not disappoint their expectations, but sent a solemn embassy to Ferdinand, to urge and demand, that the late edict should be rescinded, and that the Protestant ministers should be restored to their liberties and wonted privileges; and upon the refusal of the emperor to give any satisfaction, the prince resolved to take up arms; and accordingly published a declaration containing a full account of the reasons which had induced him to take this step. The result was, that the prince Rakotz easily routed all the forces sent against him by the emperor; so that he was now very willing to listen to reasonable terms. And, whereas the churches of the Protestants had been forcibly seized by

the Romanists, they were now, by treaty, restored, and the power of the prince was greatly increased. In this war, the son of prince Rakotz, who was one of the commanding generals, had taken Tholney as his chaplain. The consequence was, that he gained an almost unbounded influence over the young man; and gained exceedingly also upon the prince himself; by which means his general reputation and influence among the people were much increased. The superintendent of the whole district, together with a large number of the most learned and grave of the clergy, having been cut off by a pestilence which spread through the country, when the synod met to choose a successor, no one seemed to have higher claims than Tholney. Accordingly, in March 1645, he was elected to this important office. For some time, his behaviour to the clergy and churches was so affable and courteous, that many were persuaded that he was in disposition an altered man. But it was not long before he too evidently manifested his wonted arrogance and arbitrary temper, and contempt for his brethren. He now availed himself of his important station in the church to introduce his Puritanical principles and innovations. One of the things which he strenuously insisted on, was, that baptism should be administered only in the church; and even in cases of sickness, he would not permit the ministers under his superintendency to baptize children in private houses. The consequence was that many parents carried their children to the Lutheran ministers, and even to the Roman Catholic priests, for baptism; and many were suffered to die unbaptized.

One thing in his system which appeared to all inconsistent with his office and station, was, that being senior, or superintendent of all the clergy in the district, he insisted on an absolute parity of ministers, and held that the placing any one above the rest, was inconsistent with the New Testament. Here it may be remarked that the Hungarian churches, from the beginning of the reformation, were accustomed to choose a superintendent, who exercised a kind of episcopal supervision over the other clergy in the district. Neither Lutherans nor Calvinists believed, that bishops were a distinct order from presbyters; but they defended this practice upon principles of expediency. Against this arrangement Tholney proclaimed his opposition, although he had accepted, and was now with a high hand exercising, the authority of this office; for he not only required obedience from his clergy, but bound them to obedience by a solemn oath.

In conformity with his Puritanical principles, he endeavoured to have all holy-days, or church festivals, set aside; which had been observed by the Protestants in Hungary, both Lutheran and Calvinistic, uniformly. But the point on which he laid the greatest stress was, the absolute independency of each church. He held that every pastor was the sole bishop of his own flock; and that even if a church should degenerate into heresy, the neighbouring churches had no right to interfere, or at all to inflict any censure upon them. Although frequently admonished of the consequences of the course which he was pursuing, he would not desist, but went forward pursuing his own plans, in a reckless manner. The result was a state of confusion and dissension in the schools and ecclesiastical meetings; and also a state of unhappy commotion and disputation in the churches, which extended to political men. The peace of society was interrupted. Hatred and ill-will became general between the contending parties; and the whole mass of society was pervaded and disturbed by the spirit excited by these innovations. The confusion and disturbance increased to such a degree, that Tholney himself judged it to be necessary to convene a synod, to see if they could apply a remedy. But this synod, instead of tranquillizing the public mind, added oil to the fire; for they were as much divided as the people; so that after much altercation and mutual denunciations, they broke up without effecting any thing for the peace of the churches. Frequent conferences were now held among the ministers who were opposed to the innovations of Tholney, and many letters were written to the clergy of other districts for counsel and aid, in extinguishing the fire which threatened to consume the Hungarian churches. The ministers belonging to other superintendencies, while they sympathized with the difficulties and sufferings of their brethren who lived under the jurisdiction of Tholney, were of opinion that they could not with propriety interfere in these disputes, or thrust in their sickle into another's harvest.

At length Tholney was persuaded to call a more general synod, and to invite the seniors or superintendents of the neighbouring districts, to meet with them, and endeavour to compose their differences. This synod consisted of more than a hundred ministers, and met at Tokay, on the river Theiss, Feb. 14, 1646. Delegates appeared, not only from Hungary, but also from Transylvania; many of whom were men of exquisite learning and consummate prudence. As



soon as the synod was constituted, the contending parties were called before them, and asked whether they were willing to submit the whole cause to their brethren now convened; and to have it brought to issue by a regular process, one party acting as accusers, and the other as defendants. When all agreed to this, John Venayi, pastor of the church at Tartzal, and secretary of the district, undertook the part of accuser against Tholney and his associates. The charges were digested under six heads. 1. Schism. 2. Violation of his oath as superintendent. 3. Mal-administration. 4. Heterodoxy. 5. Contempt of his brethren. 6. Arbitrary acts and proceedings. All these charges were established by abundant testimony; and, indeed, Tholney did not dispute most of the facts alleged against him; but defended them: others he simply denied. But these also were confirmed by undoubted testimony.

Prince Rakotz took a deep interest in the proceedings of this synod, and transmitted to them the autographs of many important documents from the archives of his palace. He also wrote a letter to the synod in which he animadverted severely on the conduct of the innovators. The result was that Tholney and a number of his associates were found guilty. The sentence of the synod, subject to the revision of the prince, was, "That John Tholney be suspended from his office, and also from the pastoral charge of the church of Tokay. And that the ministers who had continued to adhere to him and support him, should also be suspended from the pastoral office over the flocks of which they had charge." This sentence seems to have come unexpectedly on most of these brethren. When it was read they appeared deeply affected, and begged that it might be reconsidered; but the president of the synod informed them that the sentence had been the subject of the most solemn and mature deliberation; but encouraged them to hope that at the meeting of the next general synod they might be restored. They were also informed that during their suspension their stipends would be paid as before. A full account of the proceedings of this synod was sent to the superintendents of the reformed churches who were not present. Among their other resolutions there was one relating to the call of a national synod; as the state of the church seemed to require such a measure: and prince Rakotz was requested to take upon himself the convening of such a synod at such time and place as might be judged most expedient, for the purpose of

completely terminating the dissensions which had so disturbed the Hungarian churches. The prince, after consultation had with the superintendent of Transylvania and others, issued his letters of convocation to all the seniors and pastors in Upper and Lower Hungary and Transylvania, to meet in a national synod, on the 10th of next June, at Szattmar-Nemethi, on the river Samos; and these letters recommended to all the superintendents to call meetings of their own clergy to deliberate on the state of the churches previously to the meeting of the national synod.

The synod met agreeably to the appointment in the letters of convocation; and after hearing an excellent sermon from Francis Werecky, founded on 2 Cor. xiii. 11, they chose as their president, Stephen Geleus, superintendent of all the orthodox churches in Transylvania. Upon taking the chair, he pronounced a long and elegant oration on the various stratagems of Satan against the reformed churches of Hungary and Transylvania, and illustrated his positions by many interesting facts.

As soon as the synod was regularly constituted, John Venayi, the prosecutor at the synod of Tokay, gave a lucid narrative of the proceedings of that synod, and of the sentence pronounced upon the persons accused. Tholney then arose and delivered an elaborate defence; which, however, had more the appearance of an accusation of his prosecutors and judges, than an apology for himself. A copy of his speech was immediately demanded, and was committed to the consideration of a number of grave, sagacious, and learned ministers, members of the synod. This business being thus disposed of, the synod listened to an interesting discourse from Nicholas Szattmar, pastor of a reformed church in Vis-kien, in which he demonstrated the importance of maintaining the union which had so long existed between the churches of Hungary and those of Transylvania. The synod next held a private session, in which there was opportunity for free deliberation respecting the present state of the church.

On the 20th of June, the most illustrious prince Etzedinus, entered the synod in state, and was received with all the respect due to his dignity; and Stephen Geleus, the president, addressed him in the name of the synod, and gave him a succinct account of their proceedings; and most respectfully besought his aid in terminating those disputes which had so distracted the church.

The persons to whom the oration of Tholney, and the pro-

ceedings of the synod of Tokay had been committed, now reported. Their opinion was expressed in a series of distinct propositions, which were now taken up, and discussed for many days in the synod. The result was, that the innovators were again condemned, and the sentence of the provincial synod fully sustained. Thus this troublesome business was brought to a close, and peace restored again to the churches, which had been kept so long in a state of perturbation, by the restless innovating spirit of a single individual.

The national synod, however, did not stop here, but went on to adopt a number of rules or canons, to the number of thirty, which are preserved by Lampe; and appear to have been judiciously framed. They also collected and digested into one body the acts and resolutions of former synods, for the government of the churches in Hungary and Transylvania. These amounted to one hundred.

In the year 1659, the emperor Leopold was proclaimed also king of Hungary; but before he was received as such by the nation, they insisted upon his granting certain specified conditions; one of which was the free profession of the Protestant religion; for at this time a very large majority of the people were of this denomination, and most of them belonged to the reformed or Calvinistic church.

In the year 1661, the literary world suffered an irreparable loss by the conflagration of the library of Weissenburg, which Gabriel Bethlen, prince of the district, had collected from all parts, with incredible industry; and which contained not only a rich collection of printed books, but also of ancient and valuable manuscripts.

A truce had been agreed upon between the emperor and Turks for twenty years, which terminated in the year 1665.

The efforts of the Popish party to gain the ascendancy, by the favour of the emperor, began to be more and more successful. Some unsuccessful efforts at resistance by the nobles of the country, greatly injured the cause of Protestantism in Hungary. Under the pretence of treasonable designs against the government, many of the reformed ministers were called from their flocks and their homes to Presburg, where they were treated by the king's commissioners with injustice, and unheard of cruelties. Indeed, during the year 1669, and onward, a violent persecution was carried on against the Protestant churches in Hungary and Transylvania. Some idea of the number of the reformed churches at that time may be formed from the fact, that no less than three



hundred of their houses of worship were now forcibly wrested from them, and put into the hands of the Papists. And what rendered this persecution doubly distressing was the apostasy of some of the Protestant ministers, whose violence of opposition, as is common, exceeded that of all others. At one time as many as eleven Lutheran ministers renounced Protestantism, and embraced the Popish religion; and also several of the reformed. The historian, however, records distinctly the unhappy end of most of these apostates. But the greater number continued steadfast, and manifested a constancy in suffering worthy of the primitive age. The method of proceeding against these pastors was the most insidious. A paper was artfully drawn up, which they were peremptorily required to subscribe, on pain of being subjected to capital punishment, on the pretext of purging themselves from the alleged crime of rebellion. But by doing so, they would have virtually renounced their religion, and abdicated their office as ministers. They, therefore, firmly refused to perform an act so inconsistent with their principles, while most of those ministers brought up to Presburg by the officers of government, both Lutherans and Calvinists, absolutely, many Protestant ministers, discouraged by the dark clouds which hovered over the Hungarian churches, forsook their flocks and their native country, and sought refuge in other lands. This course was highly censured by those excellent men who remained, and bore the heat of this day of persecution. They admitted that Christ permitted his disciples, when persecuted in one city, to fly to another; but maintained that the pastor of Christ's flock must not flee when he seeth the wolf coming, but should remain with them, and share in their sufferings, if he could not protect them. Of those distinguished ministers who refused subscription to the terms proposed by the government, forty-one were condemned to be sold as slaves to the Spanish galleys at Naples, for life. And to prevent a tumult among the people, they were hurried off under a military guard, and conducted by roads little frequented, until they were beyond the limits of their own country; one-fourth of this number were Lutherans and the rest Calvinists. These martyrs for the truth, were driven on as if they had been beasts of burden; exposed to every indignity and insult, which a bigoted soldiery could inflict. Some of them were aged and infirm, and before they reached Naples, the place of their destination, two expired on the way, and six they were obliged to leave at Teale (Theatina), in the kingdom of

Naples, where they suffered from hunger, sickness, vermin, filth, and reproach, more than words declare. One of these, Harsanyi, was a man of distinguished learning and abilities, and far advanced in years, who, with another, lay sick without a bed, on the dank floor of a dungeon, for more than seven weeks; and yet survived. Another was so crippled in his feet by the journey that he was unable to walk or stand; and when their prison was changed, this afflicted minister was forced to crawl on his hands and knees through mud and water. One died in prison, destitute of all external comforts: four were conducted to Naples, and placed in the galleys with their brethren. What became of the two who were unable to make the journey, is not said. Most of the galley-slaves are among the most abandoned of human beings, the sweeping of the jails of Europe; among such felons were these learned and godly ministers confined; and not only subjected to hard labour, but to the rude and profane conversation of these wretched men. But God never forsakes his own servants, who trust in him. In several instances, comfort and help were received from the most unexpected sources. In one case, those imprisoned received essential aid from a soldier on guard, who professed to be a Protestant, and not only comforted them with kind words, but gave them all the money which he could raise, by which they were preserved from starvation. And in another instance, a man of noble family, confined for manslaughter, gave to these men a part of the provision which he received for his own subsistence; and in return they gave him religious instruction, which he received with avidity, and apparently became a true Christian; and to the last moment (for he died in prison) he acknowledged Harsanyi as his spiritual father.

When it was known among the Protestant churches in Europe, that so many learned and excellent ministers had been sent to the galleys, and were there enslaved, it excited a strong feeling of sympathy. Even kings and princes participated in this feeling, and contributions were made in England, Switzerland, Holland, and Germany for their redemption. In Geneva alone, one thousand crowns were contributed, and the poorest of the people, as we learn by a letter of Francis Parretin addressed to them, came forward and begged that their mite might be accepted. This general interest in favour of these oppressed ministers was principally owing to the correspondence and exertions of two men, whose names deserve to be handed down with honour to the

latest posterity. The one was a physician of Venice, Dr. Zaff, who ceased not to address consolatory letters to the ministers themselves, and to make known their distressed condition to men of influence and benevolence in several countries of Europe. The other was a gentleman by the name of George Weltz, probably a Swiss, who spared no pains, by writing and journeying, to obtain the deliverance of these suffering servants of Jesus Christ. And he never gave over until he had accomplished his object. By securing the interposition of Van Haen, the vice-admiral of the Dutch fleet, a man of fervent piety; and especially by the authority and influence of admiral Ruyter, they were rescued from their degrading and disagreeable condition, and when brought on board the vice-admiral's ship, the pious commander not only received them cordially, but notwithstanding their filth and tattered garments, with tears of affection kissed every one of them. And they were also kindly entertained on board the lord admiral's vessel, who not only treated them courteously, but furnished them with clothing suited to their office and station, gave them a free participation of the provisions of the fleet, and offered to have them conveyed to whatever port they wished to enter. As some of them had friends at Zurich, they resorted to that city, where they were kindly entertained by the reformed pastors of the city. From this place they addressed a letter of thanks to the States General, for their deliverance, and took the occasion to entreat their High Mightinesses to interpose their good offices with the emperor to obtain religious freedom for the Hungarian churches. It is probable that this request was complied with; for soon after this time the Protestants were relieved from persecution, and the reformed churches in Hungary and Transylvania enjoyed some degree of tranquillity, and had a part of the temples of God which had been unjustly wrested from them restored. As far as is known to us, religious toleration, if not liberty, has been enjoyed by Protestants in that country unto this day; but what the state of religion has been in that country during the last hundred years, we have no satisfactory information. It is, however, entirely probable, that the same declension of vital piety and evangelical truth which has taken place in the reformed church in other countries of Europe, has been realized in Hungary also. The tendency has not been to Unitarianism during that period, as we conjecture, but to Romanism; for although Unitarian churches were once exceedingly numerous in Transylvania as well as Poland; yet



it is believed that few of them exist at present. And while one hundred years ago, the Protestants, most of whom were reformed, far exceeded the Papists in number, at present the fact is otherwise. Would it not be desirable to send a missionary into Hungary, to ascertain the present condition of the reformed churches in that country? Or if some of our enterprising travellers, who take an interest in the state of the church, would direct their course into those unexplored regions, instead of running round the common circle of France, Germany, and Switzerland, they might probably bring back some interesting ecclesiastical information.

Malte Brun, in his geographical work, makes the Lutherans now in Hungary to be above eight hundred thousand, and other Protestants about twelve hundred thousand; while the Roman Catholics amount to nearly five millions. Besides these there are nearly two millions in the communion of the Greek church; and a hundred and fifty thousand Jews. Although parts of this country were so long under the dominion of the Turks, it does not appear, that they ever made any proselytes to Islam during that period. There was at that period too much light and evangelical religion in the country to admit such a gross and carnal religion to gain influence. The following extract is from Malte Brun (Vol. IV. p. 195), "The Hungarians are in possession of religious liberty: more than half of the population profess the Catholic faith, and the dignitaries of that church possess many valuable political rights. Places are assigned to them in the diets, and they are considered the *pillars* of the court party. The archbishop of Gran possesses an annual revenue of £30,000. The income of the bishop of Erlau is about £20,000; that of Grass-Waradin £8,400; and the annual averages of the dioceses from £400 to £4,200. It may easily be believed that the first families of the country canvass for these offices. A king passed a law by which the bishopric of Erlau was set apart for the fourth son of the reigning prince. Many bishops are governors of the provinces in which they reside, and others possess monopolies on wine and salt. But although the Catholic clergy have so many advantages, they are not actuated by Christian charity to other sects. Enemies of religious freedom, they oppose every privilege claimed by heretics; but it must not be imagined that they are sufficiently powerful to oppress them, or destroy their lawful rights. The Protestants are mostly Calvinists; among those of that persuasion are many noble families; and the doctrines of the

Genevese reformer are preached in every part of the kingdom. The Lutheran creed is chiefly confined to the miners and German artizans, and exists in all the rigour of the sixteenth century. The Lutheran ministers cannot conceal their animosity against the Calvinistic preachers. The Catholic party avails itself of their strifes and contentions, and the remonstrances of the Protestants to the diet are as numerous and ineffectual as those of the Catholics to the British parliament. It is evident from the sermons of the priests, the diocesan charges, and the public edicts of the bishops, that they deplore the spread of evangelical doctrines. The Greek or Eastern church, by which the seeds of Christianity were first sown in Hungary, has been for a long time in a state of decay: more than a third of its members have apostatized to the Roman faith; but it still retains a majority of the inhabitants in the most southern provinces. The united Greek rites are observed by the Rousniacs and Wallachians.

“Transylvania is represented by a separate diet—Catholics, Calvinists, and Lutherans are represented; and a Unitarian church, the only one in the world which has existed since the time of Socinus, is acknowledged by law in Transylvania. Most of the Wallachians, the greater number of inhabitants in the province, profess the united Greek religion, but from some strange caprice, their church is only tolerated.

“The influence of an ignorant priesthood is exerted in all the Catholic seminaries, and monks have their doubts on the propriety of using astronomical instruments made by heretics.

“The danger of innovation, the fear of misapplying, or of eventually losing the funds left by pious individuals for benevolent purposes, paralyse the efforts of Protestants. Still knowledge advances: the Hungarian patriots are animated by a noble zeal; and the poor are instructed without the aid, sometimes in defiance of authority. Improvements made in other countries are adopted, and libraries formed for the use of the common people.

“The sects in Transylvania are, first, the Greek or Eastern church, which is divided into two sects, and numbers more than a million; the Catholics, about a hundred and twenty thousand; the Lutherans, a hundred and seventy thousand; the Calvinists, above two hundred thousand; and the Unitarians, forty-four thousand.”

We hope that it will not be long before some more particular and satisfactory information is given to the public respecting the present condition of the three millions of Pro-

testants, most of them Presbyterians, who still may be found in Hungary and Transylvania.

---

## ART. II.—*Gleanings from the German Periodicals.*

THE exciting topic now among the German theologians is the *Leben Jesu* (Life of Jesus), published by Strauss of Tübingen, in which the infidel theology appears to have reached its consummation. In this one book, says Tholuck, are concentrated all the skepticism and unbelief of the age. The same writer, in a sketch of the rationalistic controversy, distinguishes three periods or eras; the first extending from 1814 (when the philosophy of Schelling had given the first blow to the common-sense rationalism then prevailing) to 1827, the date of the celebrated Leipzig disputation, when Hahn advanced the doctrine, that rationalists were bound to leave the church; the second from 1827 to 1830, the date of the disturbances at Halle, when Gesenius and Wegscheider were arraigned before a royal commissioner, on a charge of treating scripture with irreverence, and when Hengstenberg's journal first maintained, that the rationalists ought to be excluded from the church. Up to this point, says Tholuck, rationalism had held fast to something positive or historical in religion, the existence of a personal God, a providence, a future state of retribution, and the historical reality of some facts contained in scripture. Premonitions now appeared, however, of ulterior changes, and a radical reform. At length, as he expresses it, the Mirabeaus of this theological revolution have been followed by a Marat. "The work of Strauss has carried negation to a point beyond which there is only one thing left. That he should have thrown down the last pilasters of this lofty temple without a tear, is deplorable enough; but he is so far a man of honour, that he has kept back nothing. We now know the Gospel of Reason in perfection."

To understand these strong expressions, it must be known that Strauss denies the *historical* truth of the gospel altogether, and explains it as a mere philosophical or religious *mythus*. He is a pantheist, and acknowledges no God but the God incarnate in the human race. And this man is writing books for popular instruction! A doctrine so extrava-



gant, as Hengstenberg observes, would in England be forgotten in a month; but the mode of education and prevailing way of thinking among the Germans of the present generation, lay them open to the influence of such a writer, in a degree which can scarcely be imagined in America, or any other country where a religious common-sense is still predominant. Tholuck predicts that a new campaign is now to open, and hints that a division will take place among the rationalists on the vital question of denying or asserting the historical verity of scripture. We find, from our journals, that the campaign has begun, but that the first division of importance has occurred upon the Christian side. Neander and Hengstenberg are now acknowledged as the heads of parties, both evangelical, in our sense of the term, but the latter very strict, the former very lax, with respect to the indulgence of diversity in sentiment, and the proper course of conduct towards the unbelievers. Neander looks upon all forms of error, involving any truth, as peculiar developments of mind and spirit, which are not to be coerced, but will, if properly controlled and guided, all come right at last. Hengstenberg maintains that religious truth is clearly revealed in a positive form, and must be definitely held on the authority of scripture. The breach between these eminent theologians (each acknowledging the other as a brother in the faith) has been gradually widening from the perpetual contact and collision of their sentiments, as colleagues in the same theological faculty; and, as a natural consequence, while one has perhaps been growing more exclusive, the other has become more latitudinarian. The opposition which has long been perceptible between these two important schools or parties (for their respective adherents are both numerous and zealous) has, we are sorry to observe, become more marked in relation to the treatment of this book of Strauss. Both, of course, have condemned its hypocritical and impious absurdity; but Neander, in so doing, has thought fit to publish his dissent from Hengstenberg as holding to an *alleinseligmachende Dogmatik*, a one-only-saving system of theology, which Neander looks upon as inconsistent both with Christian liberty and Christian love. We are neither able nor willing to go into the details of this collateral dispute, which we have mentioned, only to apprise our readers of the posture of religious matters in that interesting country. It is due to Hengstenberg to say, however, that, with all his strenuous adherence to strict principles, he is, to

say the least, no whit behind Neander in genuine charity and Christian spirit.

New Works on the Psalms.

Great attention has been paid, within a few years, to the Book of Psalms. Of the Commentary by Klauss we gave a brief account at the close of our review of Prof. Bush's work. (Bib. Rep. 1835.) Since that publication five others have appeared, either critical or practical, on that part of scripture. One of these is interesting chiefly as a novelty among the modern Germans. It is a translation and practical exposition of thirty-four Psalms, presenting the results without the actual details of philological interpretation. It is by Umbreit of Heidelberg, the author of learned works on Job and Proverbs, and one of the conductors of the *Studien und Kritiken*. He belongs to a class of theologians who have for years been receding more and more from rationalism, and may now be regarded as truly though not fully evangelical. This work is expected to exert a happy influence on students of theology. Another partial Commentary is that of Stier, an evangelical Prussian pastor, who has published an exposition of sixty selected Psalms. His design was to unite philological exactness with a Christian spirit, and to employ the improvements of the modern exegesis in the service of religion. To the pious Germans such a work will be most useful; but it can scarcely be expected that any country pastor will be able to produce much effect upon the minds of the neologists, who will scarcely listen even to a Hengstenberg or Tholuck. A third work on the Psalms is by a man named Sachs, a rationalist of the lowest class, who delights in lowering the sense of scripture to his own dead level, by preferring in all cases the most circumscribed, inadequate, and unworthy explanations, where there is a choice. The chief merit of his book, as estimated by himself, consists in a German version corresponding with the Hebrew, as nearly as possible, in idiom, form, and rhythm. This method of translation, which is fashionable in Germany, and for which the language affords great facilities, was applied to scripture on a large scale, first by Rückert in his version of the Prophets. In order to attain his purpose, Sachs seems to have sacrificed all purity, propriety, and elegance of diction. The very opposite extreme to that of Sachs has been preferred by Ewald in his work upon the Psalms, forming the first volume of a general work on the poetical books of the Old

Testament. Of this work upon the Psalms the second part has come out first, containing the translation and commentary, while an introduction is to occupy the other. So far from sacrificing German style or idiom to exact imitation, he has sacrificed the peculiar form and spirit of the Hebrew poets to a kind of measured prose or irregular blank verse, which he has chosen as the dress of his translation. Those who know Ewald as a grammarian will be surprised to learn that in this work the philological element is almost swallowed up in the logical, historical, and soi-disant philosophical mode of exposition. Nothing can be more characteristic of the author than the confident precision and authoritative tone with which he determines the chronological order and historical occasion of the several Psalms. We are inclined to think that this first extended specimen of Ewald's exposition, since he attained his present standing as a Hebrew grammarian, will rather injure than advance his reputation. Like many other celebrated writers he has thrown into the back-ground that in which his strength consists, and spent his labour in transmuting sense to nonsense, by enveloping the simple exposition of the scriptures in a fog of transcendental metaphysics. Besides this general fault, there are some things which betray a lamentable want of taste and judgment, such as his substituting *Jahve* for *Jehovah*, which (even admitting all that he asserts) is very puerile and wholly inconsistent, as one of his reviewers well observes, with his writing *Jordan* instead of *Jarden*. In some respects his language is more Christian than that of Gesenius, De Wette, and the like: but such expressions are to be interpreted by the rules of Hegel, whose follower he is. The only interesting fact which we can add, without transcending limits, is that Ewald recognises David as the author of some Psalms, which De Wette looks upon as doubtful, viz. Ps. 3, 4, 7, 11, 101, and parts of Ps. 19 and 24. The 62d he ascribes to Jeremiah, the 42d, 43d, and 84th to Jeconiah or Jehoiakim. It is somewhat remarkable that nearly at the same time with this book of Ewald, there appeared one on the same subject by his admirer and disciple, Hitzig.\* This, however, is not so extensive in its plan, being merely introductory to a work in preparation. It contains a translation of the Psalms, with *critical* notes, i. e. notes upon the text. The version, so far

\* Some account of Hitzig's work on Isaiah is given in our last number, pp. 94, 95.



as we have seen it, is free from the defects and faults of Ewald's; but the author's textual criticisms are completely spoiled by a mania for conjectural emendations, which we supposed had been buried in the tomb of the Capelluses and Houbigants and Lowths of other days. We must wait for the Commentary before we form a judgment, but our present prepossession is, that Hitzig's work will be, in all respects, superior to Ewald's, and, except in point of taste, to De Wette's also.

#### Roman Catholic Exegesis.

A new edition of Bengel on the Apocalypse, which appeared at Stuttgart in 1834, has called into existence an extraordinary specimen of exegesis by a Roman Catholic layman, J. A. Boost. It is entitled "An exposition of the Revelation of John, in the spirit of history and religion, being a refutation of Bengel's exposition." It forms an octavo volume of 114 pages, and was published at Darmstadt, in the duchy of Hesse. The author hurries over the first six seals, in respect to which he agrees very much with Bengel, and lays out all his strength upon the seventh. The subject of ch. 10, he thinks, is the revival of letters and science after the conquest of Constantinople, with its results, the discovery of America and the art of printing. The little open book (v. 2), which was sweet in the mouth and bitter in the belly (v. 9, 10), represents the freedom of the press, with its specious advantages and calamitous effects! The two witnesses in ch. 11, are the orders of monks and nuns, who seemed to be destroyed by the progress of false *illumination*, but are constantly reviving. The temporary advantage gained over monachism by the new light, was followed by reformation and revolution. The woman in ch. 12 is the Virgin Mary, the mother of the church. The *two wings of a great eagle* (v. 14) represent the protection afforded to the church by the double eagle of the imperial Austrian standard. The dragon is the devil. The beast rising out of the sea (ch. 13) is the English revolution. The other beast (v. 11) is the French revolution. Mr. Boost finds even the tricoloured cockade in this chapter. The number of the beast (v. 18) is LVDoVICs, which he strangely explains to mean, "the murderer of Louis, regicida revolutionis." The *leopard* (v. 2) is England, the *bear* Scotland, the *lion's mouth* Ireland, the *ten horns* democracy. Babylon (ch. 14) is Paris; the second angel proclaims the alliance of the great powers in the east

of Europe, the battle of Leipzig, the downfall of Paris, &c.; the third angel proclaims the restoration of religion, retarded by the depravity of man. In ch. 16: 10, when the fifth vial is poured out, it is the demagogues, or revolutionary radicals, who gnaw their tongues with pain, because their plans do not succeed. The *kings of the east* (v. 12) are the great powers in the east of Europe, allied in opposition to the antichrist of revolution. These conquer when the seventh vial is emptied (vs. 17, 18), France is divided into three parts (v. 19), and Paris receives the punishment which it escaped in 1814. The *mother of harlots and abominations of the earth* (ch. 17) is the reformation in England! Ch. 18 is a song of triumph over the fall of England, and particularly London, *that great city* (v. 21). After the destruction of France and England, the faithful are to form one body, and those who have gone astray are to be re-united with the hundred millions in Europe who still adhere to the true faith. The rider, whose name was *Faithful and True* (ch. 19: 11), is Ferdinand, the new emperor of Austria. The last three chapters relate to the restoration of heretics and the absorption of all religions in the church of Rome. One great means of this blessed consummation is the restoration of the Jesuits. This tissue of extravagant absurdities might teach a useful lesson to some Protestant interpreters of prophecy.

#### The German Periodicals.

Tholuck, in his *Anzeiger*, gives a rapid sketch of the German theological journals, from which we glean a few facts that may interest our readers. There are four works devoted to literature in general, which have not been without their influence on theological learning. The oldest of these, the *Jenaische Litteraturzeitung* (Jena Literary Gazette), has now but a limited circulation, and is the advocate of obsolete opinions. The *Hallische Litteraturzeitung* (Halle Literary Gazette) contains more solid learning, and gives valuable information with respect to books; among its contributors are such men as Paulus, Bretschneider, and the theologians of the same stamp at Halle. Both these journals are described as belonging to the *ancien régime* of rationalism. The *Berliner Jahrbücher* (Berlin Annals) are of a more modern cast; their philosophical shibboleth is that of Hegel; but the theological department is entrusted, for the most part, to young writers. The *Heidelberger Jahrbücher* (Heidelberg

Annals) and Göttinger Anzeigen (Göttingen Review) are of less importance theologically, especially since the multiplication of works exclusively theological. The Leipziger Repertorium and Berliner Litteraturzeitung give lists of all new publications, with analyses and brief critical notices of the more important. All the works above named are of a general character, but include theology as one of their departments. Among the Catholics of Germany theological journals are not yet very popular. The Neue Theologische Zeitschrift (New Theological Journal) of Pletz, a distinguished theologian and church dignitary of Austria, has but five hundred subscribers. The journal for the (Catholic) clergy of Freiburg, edited by the celebrated Hug, expired with the seventh number for want of aid. Better success has attended the Tübingen Quartalschrift (Tübingen Quarterly), and new Catholic journals have been set up at Bonn and Giessen, which possess considerable literary merit. Among the Protestants, the Predigerbibliothek (Preacher's Library), edited by Röhr, court-preacher to the duke of Saxe-Weimar, is the organ and standard of old-fashioned common-sense rationalism, which sets itself as much in opposition to the vagaries of German philosophy as it does to the truths of genuine Christianity. By a great proportion of German theologians, whether infidel or Christian, this form of doctrine is considered obsolete. To the same school belongs the Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung (General Church Gazette), but with less pretence to literary merit. Its tirades against orthodoxy, mysticism, and Hegelianism, are said to be written, for the most part, by country clergymen. As occupying middle ground between decided rationalism and genuine Christianity, Tholuck mentions the Zeitschrift für Theologen (Journal for Theologians) by Illgen of Leipzig, which is chiefly devoted to church-history; the Evangelische Zeitung (Evangelical Journal) of Tübingen, which contains elaborate articles on theological literature; and the Studien der Württembergischen Geistlichkeit (Studies of the Württemberg clergy), which contains a greater variety of matter, and has a more practical character. The Theologische Studien und Kritiken (Theological Studies and Criticisms), edited by Ullmann and Umbreit, though it admits a great diversity of sentiment, may be considered as decidedly in favour of evangelical religion; and while many of its articles would be regarded as heretical with us, it has certainly exercised a salutary influence on the young German clergy and students of



theology, by combining a high degree of literary merit with a religious spirit. In this last particular its character has greatly risen since the principal conductor became intimately associated and attached to Tholuck. Rheinwald's Repertorium is the best periodical in Germany for fulness and variety of intelligence and criticism on theological subjects. The editor is a professor at Bonn, but the work is published at Berlin. Its plan embraces all departments of theology in the widest sense, and its contents are chiefly lists and notices of books, with articles or paragraphs of ecclesiastical intelligence, and now and then a dissertation on some subject of church-polity. We have often been indebted to its pages, and believe that, for a foreigner who wishes to be fully informed of what is going on among all classes of the German theologians, it is the most valuable of their publications. To the above list must be added the *Litterarischer Anzeiger für Christliche Theologie*, conducted by Tholuck himself. His own articles are always full of talent and mostly of instruction, and the fact that, even with the help of friends, he can issue a small sheet twice in ten days, is only another proof of his astonishing activity, versatility, and fertility of mind. His journal is characterized by learning, genius, taste, deep piety, and a liberality which would with us be called latitudinarianism, and which is strongly contrasted with the calm, firm, strenuous orthodoxy of the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, edited by Hengstenberg, which does not fall within our present scope, as it is not a theological but a religious journal, that is, according to the German terminology, it is designed for general not professional circulation.

#### German Theological Seminaries.

The peculiar organization of the German universities is generally known, with its good and bad effects upon professional education, particularly that of theologians. With respect to the theological seminaries of Germany there has been less said and written in this country. These are institutions intended to complete the training of students in theology after leaving the university. They are few, and the number of students is limited. The most noted establishments of this kind are at Herborn in Nassau and at Wittenberg in Prussian Saxony. The studies and exercises of the members are practical, that is, intended to prepare them directly for pastoral duty. The systematic study of theology, and its kindred sciences, is presupposed. As the directors of these

seminaries are excellent men, and few seek admission but the conscientious votaries of truth, it is not surprising that their influence is good, and that some of the best pastors in the church of Prussia have been seminarists at Wittenberg. The utility and proper organization of such seminaries has been recently a subject of discussion. From one publication on the subject we shall give an abridged account of the routine of duties in the *Predigerseminar* in Wittenberg, of which the writer whom we quote had been a member. Of the two teachers in this institution, one is required to be an actual pastor; both are preachers. They deliver lectures, exegetical, historical, and dogmatical. The first are on the more important parts of the New Testament, especially the *pericopes* or *lessons* of the Prussian liturgy. The critical study of the text is presupposed. The lectures are designed, not so much to explain the passage, as to show how it ought to be explained in preaching. The technical term applied in Germany to this branch of theology is *Topik*. Alternately with these instructions, lectures are delivered on *Apologetik* or the evidences of religion. The historical lectures are not on the general subject of church-history, which the members of the seminary are supposed to have previously studied, but on the history of preaching, church-discipline, and forms of worship. With these is connected the reading of the best ancient and modern sermons. Besides the lectures, exegetical and theological disputations are held, in the Latin language, under the direction of the teachers, who also conduct *homiletical* and *catechetical* exercises, by which are to be understood practical exercises in the art of preaching and of popular instruction. Morning prayer is accompanied with sacred music, and immediately followed by a lecture. On Saturday and Sunday there is also evening prayer, which, on Sunday, is followed by an exhortation from the *Ephorus* on the duties and dangers of the pastoral office. It is the custom of the house to celebrate Luther's birth day in a religious manner, and, in 1830, a similar respect was paid to St. Augustin. Besides the public exercises of the house, there are various formal and informal societies among the students for religious conference, mutual aid in study, and improvement in music. The musical members sometimes give concerts, and a student is often waked upon the morning of his birth day by the instruments and voices of his friends. The present instructors of this seminary, we believe, are Heubner and Ross.

## Tholuck's Sermons.

Tholuck has published an additional volume of sixteen sermons preached before the university of Halle, with an interesting preface on the decline and revival of church-going in Germany. While he justly ascribes the former to the growth of infidelity among the clergy, he shows that a mere return to orthodox piety will not be sufficient to re-fill the churches. Among the means which he considers necessary to secure that end, is a thorough and scholar-like acquaintance with the scriptures. He also recommends the practice of lecturing at times, instead of preaching, on the scriptures in their order. Might not both these suggestions be made useful in America? Tholuck is entitled to be heard upon this subject, as his own preaching not only attracts crowds to the long-deserted academical *Gottesdienst*, but has been blessed to the spiritual benefit of many.

## New Work on Daniel.

The book of Daniel is, next to the Pentateuch, the most important subject of dispute at present, between the believing and unbelieving critics. The first serious attack upon the genuineness of that invaluable part of revelation, since the days of Porphyry, was made by Bertholdt in his introduction to the Bible, and followed up by Bleek of Bonn, and other writers of inferior note. The cause had, by some good men, been given up as lost, when a powerful reaction was produced by the appearance of Hengstenberg's work (*die Authentie des Daniel*), which was reviewed in the *Biblical Repertory* of 1832. A year later, the same distinguished champion of the truth published, in the second volume of his *Christologie*, a masterly dissertation on the seventy weeks. About the same time, one of his pupils and adherents in the faith, Hävernicks, afterwards professor at Geneva, now at Rostock, brought out a complete work on Daniel, which is universally regarded as an admirable specimen of oriental learning and exegetical talent, and an able, if not a satisfactory, defence of the genuineness, authenticity, canonical authority, and inspiration of the book. These publications of Hengstenberg and Hävernicks, made so strong an impression on the public mind, by their logical precision and philological depth, that the neologists have been under the necessity of trying to counteract the dangerous reaction. This has been attempted by Dr. Cæsar von Lengerke, in an exposition of Daniel, published at Königsberg in 1835. This work undertakes to establish



the mythical character of the book, not partially, but out and out. In this the author excels his rationalistic predecessors, both in boldness and consistency. Von Lengerke's work is not considered by the friends of truth in Germany as having driven the defenders of Daniel from the strong position actually gained; but it seems to be admitted that he has exposed some errors and defects upon the part of Hävernicks. If this should excite that young but distinguished writer to supply what is deficient in his work and make it perfect, the cause of truth will be a gainer by this controversy, as by every other. The more the rationalists write in opposition to Hengstenberg and his school, the more will they expose their weakness and the badness of their cause.

*New Works on Chronicles.*

Another part of scripture, which had long been given up to the neologists as lawful prey, has also met of late with able champions. We refer to the books of *Chronicles*, on which De Wette and Gesenius have been wont to lavish their contempt without restraint, as a bungling compilation, scarcely worthy to be named as an authority. Those who are familiar with the writings of these learned men, will recollect how coolly De Wette sets aside the positive statements of the inspired historian, and how modestly Gesenius undertakes to know the meaning of a Hebrew phrase better than the author of the *Chronicles*. To this critical presumption a severe check has been given by two recent works in vindication of the *Chronicles*. The latest, by Movers, has not reached this country; the other, by Keil, we have long had in possession and intended to review. The author, another pupil and follower of Hengstenberg, has copied, with wonderful success, the perspicuity, exactness, and strict logic of his master, and we trust that his labours (as professor at Dorpat) will be blessed, not only in their direct effect upon his hearers, but in a wider influence exerted through the press, in vindication and elucidation of the word of God. The estimation in which Keil and Hävernicks are held by their former teachers, Hengstenberg and Tholuck, is an earnest of the good which may be looked for at their hands. It is one of the most encouraging signs of the times in Germany, that while some of the most distinguished pupils of the rationalistic leaders are receding from the precipice to which their gifted teachers had enticed them, the Christian theologians are sending out recruits, who will be able to do battle for the

truth, when the standard-bearers themselves shall faint or be discharged.

Hegel and Schelling.

To those who know any thing of German philosophy, it may be an interesting item of intelligence, that a schism has occurred in the sect of the Hegelians, on the question whether Hegel's system recognises *the personal duration of the human soul*. Göschel, a distinguished leader of that school, has written in defence of the affirmative position, while by other Hegelians he is charged with a desertion of his principles. He has also been attacked by some anti-hegelians, who charge upon the system the denial of the doctrine of immortality. Among these assailants is a second Fichte. From some expressions of the periodical writers, there would seem to be a chance of Schelling's superseding Hegel in his turn, and again becoming lord of the ascendant. This sort of resurrection would be something quite unparalleled in Germany; but Schelling certainly has this advantage, that, though his philosophy is looked upon as dead, he himself is still alive, and lecturing with great applause as an honorary professor at Munich, with a *Von* before his name, and the rank of a privy counsellor. His opinions are said to have been greatly changed, and he is now a Roman Catholic. His great work on the four ages of the world (*Weltalter*) is, we believe, in preparation still; we have heard that he has several times begun to print it and then cancelled the impression.

Raumer's Palestine.\*

A valuable addition to the apparatus of biblical inquirers has been furnished by Von Raumer of Erlangen, in his work on Palestine. It is highly commended by Hengstenberg and Tholuck, or by writers in their journals, for the skill and judgment with which it is adapted to a particular class of readers, not the learned but the learners, such as students of theology and educated laymen. "Those who know how hard it is, in a work requiring original research, to give only the results, without forcing the reader to participate in all the labours of investigation, will admire the self-denial of this author." The work evinces likewise a laborious and

\* Palaestina, von K. v. Raumer, Prof. in Erlangen. Mit dem Plane von Jerusalem zur Zeit der Zerstörung durch Titus, und dem Grundriss der kirche des heiligen Grabes. Leipzig, 8vo. pp. 358.

faithful study of authorities, though Tholuck's review complains of a defect in the distinction made between the authorities themselves, as more or less entitled to belief, and Hengstenberg's refers to a few errors arising from a want of thorough intimacy with the Hebrew text. Both admit, however, that scarcely any source of information seems to have been neglected; the author has even availed himself of statements only extant in English and American periodicals. Another point in which the work has very signal merit, is the elegant conciseness of its style, which not only renders it entirely perspicuous, but has enabled the author to incorporate more matter than the limits of the book would seem to suffer. But the crowning merit of the work is its religious spirit, and the author's constant reference to higher interests than those of geographical science. He seems never to forget that the land which he describes is the Holy Land; and though he properly dispenses with mere exclamations and pious forms of speech, he keeps the reader in perpetual recollection of the dignity of his subject. Who, says Hengstenberg, would praise a description of England, in which there was no mention of her trade and manufactures? Yet England would be more without her trade and manufactures than Palestine would be without her God! These merits are so great, and the defects which have been pointed out so unimportant, that the book may be confidently spoken of, as one of first-rate excellence. The volume of Ritter's General Geography, which has recently been published or is shortly to appear, will contain a new edition of his Palestine. The only point in which it is expected to excel Von Raumer's, as a book for students, is its general surveys and descriptions of the country, from which Von Raumer has abstained for fear of indulging his imagination, and confined himself to the precise statements of travellers who have been upon the spot.

#### *Ministerial Qualifications.*

The examination of candidates for ordination is thus described by a writer in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*. A candidate, from twenty to twenty-six years old, appears before a consistory to which he is a stranger. He exhibits written exercises previously prepared, and is sometimes required to furnish others in the presence of his judges, after which he is subjected to an oral examination, with some half-a-dozen others, for about five hours, more or less. The subjects of examination are the Greek and Hebrew text



of scripture, Systematic Theology, Church History, Homiletics, and in some cases Logic. He receives a mark denoting his proficiency, and then the door is open for his entrance to the fold, to feed the flock which Christ has purchased with his blood. Whether he only knows the truth, or really understands it; whether he only understands the truth, or really believes it; whether he has a gift for winning souls, or is cold and blockish; whether he has lived a blameless life, or quite the contrary—are questions never asked. The things complained of, in this system, by the writer whom we quote, are, first, the total disregard to religious or even moral character, and then, the too exclusive requisition of professional acquirements, without reference to general knowledge or preparatory education. A young man is often passed by his examiners, even with applause, because he writes good Latin and is a good Hebraist, though he cannot write or speak his mother-tongue correctly. As a remedy, the writer urges that the examinations should be more comprehensive and, at least in part, conducted by actual pastors. His plan indeed is, that the first examination (for the *licentia concionandi*) should be held by theological professors, and relate especially to theoretical knowledge; the second (for ordination) by other clergymen, and relate to the application of the knowledge possessed. The statements of this writer, if we had room to quote them, might be useful in correcting two mistakes somewhat current in this country; the idea that the modern German clergy are, as a body, very learned; and the idea that the German university system is better adapted to prepare men for professional activity than ours. As to the latter point, the writer referred to thinks the establishment of theological seminaries, in which the students may be subject to inspection and control, a measure essential to the completeness of the universities and the welfare of the church. As to the other point, he draws a contrast between the German pastors of the present day and those who lived at the time of the reformation, or at the beginning of the seventeenth century, not only as to orthodoxy and religious character, but in point of erudition. What names, for example, can be found among the modern clergy of Hamburgh, Lubeck, and Bremen, to be placed in competition with those of Wolf, Fabricius, Hinckelmann, Pfeiffer, and Carpzov? Another sentence from this interesting article we quote for the consideration of our brethren at home, allowing them to value it at what they think it worth. After speaking of the

best means for excluding heretics and unbelievers from the ministry, he asks : " But in order to produce fair flowers, is it enough to root out all the weeds? Seed, living seed, is wanted. Mere negative purification is the curse of the present age in politics; it must not find its way into the church. . . . . When the ecclesiastical approval of Marmontel's *Belisarius* was withdrawn, 40,000 copies were sold, before the proceedings in the case were closed. . . . The end is not to be attained by warnings or denunciations, but by men; by having the right men set in the right places."

*New Churches.*

In Prussia, as in England, the need of new churches begins to be acknowledged. Under the influence of English example, Frederick William has already founded several in the suburbs of Berlin. Most, if not all, of these have been supplied with evangelical and devoted pastors, among whom is Otto von Gerlach, a name dear to some in America and many more in Europe. A general increase in the means of accommodation and the number of pastors has become a frequent subject of discussion. It is computed that the population of protestant Germany has, at least, doubled since the Reformation, while the protestant clergy is scarcely more numerous than then. The majority of the present pastors, being worldly men, feel little solicitude to make a change which might diminish their own incomes. But the faithful shepherds, of whom there are not a few, especially in Wurttemberg and Western Prussia, are anxious that their number should be multiplied, the rather as the number of candidates is much too great for the existing vacancies, and as the proportion of sincere and godly men among them constantly increases. Of the two ways in which the want may be supplied, by increasing the number of pastors in the parishes, and by dividing the parishes themselves, the latter seems to be preferred by those who are best qualified to judge. Some, however, are in favour of appointing deacons, in the episcopal sense, to act as under-shepherds to the pastors, an arrangement which exists in some of the German states, but not in Prussia. There the organization of the individual churches is essentially Presbyterian, and includes an order of deacons who, like ours, are supposed to attend to the wants of the poor. The clergy in the western Prussian provinces appear to be attached to this system, and such of them as feel the need of some improvement in the church, while

they urge the multiplication of pastors, with separate parochial charges, wish the diaconate, as it exists, to be made efficient, by appointing deacons who shall labour among the poor, not by preaching, but by bringing them to church, providing them with work, reclaiming them from vicious habits, superintending Sunday schools, and dispensing such instruction as they can, in strict subordination to the pastors. On the other hand, the friends of true religion in Berlin and the adjacent provinces, seem partial to the constitution of the English church, and would therefore prefer the transformation of lay-deacons into ordained ministers of an inferior order. As Presbyterians, we prefer the former method, but should heartily rejoice to see either realized, the rather as we know that the German theologians are too deeply versed in history, and some of them, at least, endowed with souls too large, to be infected with the mania of exclusive high-church prelacy or believe in the theory of triple ordinations. The question of church government is looked upon in Germany as something settled, and we have it on the authority of a professor of church history in Prussia, that the divine right of bishops is one of the few doctrines which no protestant in Germany seems able to believe.

•      *Persecution of the Tyrolese Protestants.*

Eight or nine years ago three men residing in the valley of the Ziller, near the confluence of the Ziller and the Zem, in the Tyrol, declared themselves Protestants, since which time more than three hundred have followed their example. Against these converts there has raged a persecution, not by fire and sword, now obsolete, but by the more refined and galling arts of modern bigotry. The Austrian Toleration Act, or rather Edict, requires every person going over to the Protestants, to receive six weeks special instruction from his parish priest before the final step is taken. This instruction was refused to the converts of the Zillertal. They must therefore remain in the church and be disciplined as heretics. Their children are, against the parents' will, presented in the church for baptism by Popish sponsors. Being thus made "catholics," they are forced to attend the public schools, and, at the age of eight or nine, to receive their "first communion." The priests refuse to solemnize the marriage of heretics, a circumstance which has caused two of the converts to go back. They are not allowed to purchase land or houses, and those who had families before, are unable to



hire servants. They are of course not allowed to hold religious meetings, nor even to visit the sick among themselves, who are infested without mercy by the priests, one of whom assured a dying man, just as he breathed his last, that he was certainly going straight down to the devil (*schnurgrade zum Teufel*). Not only are the heretics denied what they consider Christian burial, but the mode of their interment is contemptuous and disgraceful. Three of their number obtained access, five years since, to the Emperor Francis, when at Innsbruck, since which time none are allowed to leave the valley. The number of priests in the valley is increased, and they are indefatigable in exciting prejudice against the converts, and confirming others in ignorance and bigotry, by means of pretended miracles, &c. At the same time they try to make their victims still more miserable by exciting groundless fears, and raising false reports of what the emperor intends to do, by way of punishing the heretics. The object of these priests of Baal would be greatly furthered, if the little flock could be provoked or seduced into any act of insubordination or fanatical excess. But they have hitherto been so sustained and guided by divine grace, that their conduct, as a body, has been blameless. In their domestic and municipal relations they have set a beautiful example of forbearance and submission. This is the more remarkable as they have had no spiritual guide from the beginning. Each household is a little church, where God is worshipped and the Bible read, together with some writings of Luther, Arndt, and Müller. Their benevolence is such that all the power of the priests is insufficient to deter the poor from coming to them. These details are taken from a paper in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, which was probably designed, not only to excite a general sympathy, but to secure the intercession of the Prussian government with that of Austria, in behalf of these poor sufferers, whose voice can never reach the throne, through all the complex folds of a paternal but tyrannical police. We trust that long ere this the Protestant member of the Holy Alliance has prevailed upon his colleague to call off his blood-hounds, or the pope's, from these oppressed lambs of the Saviour's flock.

*Projected Work on Missions.*

In order to satisfy the growing curiosity of German Christians with respect to foreign missions, a repentent, or assistant professor, at Erlangen, has projected a series of missionary

biographies, and another of missionary travels. The first was to open with the life of Pliny Fisk, to be followed by the lives of Brainerd, Eliot, Schwartz, Vanderkemp, Martyn, Parsons, Carey, Morrison, Newell, Judson, and many others. The other series was to open with the travels of Tyerman and Bennet, to be followed by translations or abridgments of Ellis on Polynesia, Jowett on the Mediterranean, Philip on South Africa, Anderson on Greece, Smith and Dwight on Armenia, Kay on Caffraria, Gobat and Kugler on Abyssinia, Wolff on Asia, Gutzlaff and Abeel on China, Yate on New Zealand, Temple on the Mediterranean, Ellis on Madagascar, Henderson on Iceland, Henderson and Pinkerton on Russia, Brewer on Constantinople, Groves on Persia. The editor intends to incorporate with the narratives, or append to them as notes, various geographical and historical statements which lie scattered through the missionary journals, and throughout the series he will have reference, not only to the edification and entertainment of his readers, but to the promotion of historical and geographical science, by means of the information brought to light by missionaries, but as yet existing only in a loose and scattered state.

*Religion in High Places.*

A society of young ladies in Berlin published, some time since, a memoir of the princess Louisa Henrietta of Brandenburg, first wife of the elector Frederick William, who, it seems, was an eminently pious woman, and the author of some favourite German hymns. The *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, in noticing this little book, expresses a wish that some one would prepare an account of the manifestations of true piety in various members of the royal race of Brandenburg and Prussia. The writer seems to intimate that Frederick the Great was the only interruption to the line of pious rulers in this family. The present crown prince, or heir-apparent, is believed, on good authority, to be a sincere Christian. The king's pretensions to that character are greatly lowered by his inordinate attachment to the theatre. In no other respect is he believed to go beyond the strict simplicity and moderation of a Christian gentleman. His personal manners and his mode of living are extremely plain, and he is certainly a steadfast friend to orthodox religion, in opposition to the infidel theology. In such a king and such an heir-apparent, Prussia is highly favoured. It is such examples that make despotism respectable.

ART. III.—*Views in Theology*, by Lyman Beecher, D.D., President of Lane Theological Seminary. Published by request of the Synod of Cincinnati. Cincinnati: Truman and Smith. New York: Leavitt, Lord & Co. 1836. pp. 240. 12mo.

THIS work had its origin in the prosecution of Dr. Beecher upon charges of heresy, before the presbytery, and subsequently before the synod of Cincinnati. By both these bodies he was acquitted; but the synod at the same time requested him to publish, at as early a day as possible, "a concise statement of the argument and design of his sermon on native depravity, and of his views of total depravity, original sin, and regeneration, agreeably to his declaration and explanation before synod." In compliance with this request, Dr. Beecher published his *Views in Theology*, which is an enlarged and illustrated edition of the defence made upon his trial. The opinions of a man so eminent in abilities, and in station, would be matter of public interest, independent of the peculiar circumstances which, in this case, imparted to them additional importance; and we intended, therefore, at the time when his work appeared, to make it the subject of examination and remark. But this purpose was then laid aside, for reasons with which it is not necessary to trouble the public; and it is now resumed, because recent events and discussions have again broken the silence which had begun to prevail in relation to Dr. Beecher and his opinions, and rendered it important to ascertain how much ground he has really given for the doubts and suspicions which many seem to entertain. We have therefore recurred to his *Views in Theology*, in contrast with his other publications, and the result of this comparison we are about to lay before our readers.

We cannot sympathize with Dr. Beecher in the complaints which he makes that he should be called upon to defend his orthodoxy before an ecclesiastical tribunal. He speaks of "the necessity of explanation imposed on him by *unfounded accusations*;" and compares himself with "an aged merchant of long-established reputation called upon to prove his honesty by the exhibition of his books; or a physician of age and experience, to repel the suspicion of quackery by publishing an account of his cases and his practice."

We must be permitted to say, without intending any dis-



respect to Dr. Beecher, that his comparisons seem to us very inapposite. In his analogous cases of hardship, the merchant and physician are called upon to prove that they possess qualities which the public estimation, founded on long observance of their conduct, has assigned to them. But we are not aware that Dr. Beecher has ever enjoyed the reputation of possessing views of theological truth, that were profound, well-defined, and carefully adjusted to the standards of Presbyterian orthodoxy. A reputation he has indeed had, and well has he earned it, of a man of commanding intellect, of comprehensive grasp of mind, capable of seizing upon the great features of any subject and holding them up, covered with light, to the view of others. The reputation, too, he has had of a zealous and successful preacher of the gospel. And who has called in question his substantial merit in any of these respects? Had he been arraigned for weakness of intellect, or accused in relation to any of the matters upon which his public reputation rests, we would have been ready to make common cause with him, and lift up our voices higher even than his own, in outcry upon the injustice and cruelty of the accusation. But no such charge has been made: no one within our knowledge has sought to detract aught from the reputation which Dr. Beecher has acquired; or so far questioned the justice of the public award on his behalf, as to call upon him now at an advanced stage of life to prove that he is entitled to it. His prosecution touched upon matters entirely distinct from those excellencies which public estimation has assigned to him. So far was Dr. Beecher's reputation for orthodoxy from being extensively and firmly established, as in the case of the merchant or physician which he brings forward, that, before he left New England, many were the doubts and fears entertained of him, in this respect, among those who had the best opportunities for ascertaining his opinions. If the accusations against him are so utterly groundless, if his defence of his orthodoxy be a mere gratuity, forced from him only by the unreasonable prejudices of others, it surely becomes him to explain the remarkable fact that he should have been so grievously misunderstood, not only by Dr. Wilson, but by Dr. Porter of Andover, and by many others in New England, who must be supposed capable of understanding even the subtlest discussions in theology, and who were under no bias save one that would dispose them to judge favourably of Dr. Beecher. The Doctor's writings are not ordinarily marked by obscu-

rity. On the contrary, we do not know any writer who, in general, seizes more directly or illuminates more strongly any subject which he undertakes to discuss. Why is it then that the soundness of his views on the subjects of original sin, depravity, and regeneration, were called in question before he left New England by many of his brethren who were most intimately associated with him? Had these doubts of his orthodoxy arisen in some remote region, they might be supposed to have proceeded from the misconstruction of some isolated passage in his writings, or from the erroneous reports of others upon his opinions. If the ignorant only had entertained them, we might suppose that they had been merely alarmed by some new phraseology in which Dr. Beecher was preaching familiar truths; or had they been found only among his enemies, we might conclude that prejudice had led them to torture his words into an unfavourable meaning. But these misgivings had their origin in the sphere within which he lived and laboured; among those who were most familiar with his writings, and sermons, and conversation; among men who, having been trained to theological investigation, would not be likely to mistake an old truth merely because it was presented in a new dress; and among men too who had been accustomed to respect and love Dr. Beecher, and whose minds would be slow, therefore, in taking up any opinion to his hurt. If he was misunderstood at the west because his brethren there were not able to draw the distinction, of which he is so fond, between a theological doctrine and the philosophy of that doctrine, why was he misunderstood in New England? He surely will not deny that there are men there, and men too among those who have questioned or doubted his orthodoxy, who can dive with him into any of the depths of philosophy, or ascend with him, *pari passu*, to any of its heights. Until Dr. Beecher will condescend to give some rational explanation of the origin of these doubts of his orthodoxy in New England, and the subsequent and independent origin of similar doubts at the west, we cannot but consider his complaint of "unfounded accusations" as unbecoming and slanderous. The effect of this complaint is to present his prosecutor as coming forward, in the mere gratuity of mischief, to interrupt his labours, and to distract the church with needless controversy and litigation; and it throws upon all who have expressed their doubts of his soundness, the odium of weakening that harmony and mutual confidence which ought to exist between ministers of the

same church. We cannot, therefore, suffer the assertion that the charges against him were groundless to pass unchallenged. We cannot believe that so many men, as wise and good as Dr. Beecher, would permit their confidence in him to be destroyed or weakened, unless he had been imprudent enough to give them some cause for it. And we are persuaded that Dr. Beecher would have added to his reputation if, instead of bespeaking in a tone of arrogant superiority the mercy of the court for his prosecutor,\* and maintaining his own entire blamelessness, he had frankly admitted, at least, that he had made use on some occasions of incautious and imprudent phraseology which had naturally given rise to misapprehension of his views. The blame of the interruption of ministerial confidence, as far as he is concerned, would, to be sure, have been fixed upon himself by this avowal; but there it must be fixed, whether he be willing to receive it or not; there, if we mistake not, public estimation has already fixed it; and his frank assumption of it would have done him good instead of harm.

So much ground has Dr. Beecher really given for misapprehension of his theological opinions, that it is no easy matter even now to understand what he really believes. If we had only his *Views in Theology* to consult, we could readily understand him; but when we compare certain statements of doctrine in this work with his previous writings, we are perplexed beyond measure. We find him at different times avowing directly contrary opinions on the same subject.—With an ordinary man, we should at once settle this difficulty, by saying that he had doubtless seen good reason to change his opinions, and that we must learn what his present sentiments are from the latest publication of them. But Dr. Beecher cuts us off from this explanation in his own case by assuring us, “that his doctrinal views have been unchanged from the beginning,” “that he is in doctrine what he ever was;” and we are left therefore utterly at a loss in our conjectures, whether his earlier or his later writings contain the true exposition of his present views. There are statements in these writings, which no ingenuity of explanation can reconcile,—there are discrepancies which no sophistry can bridge over,—and the perception of these, in connexion with his declaration, that he has never changed his views, has involved us in bewilderment and doubt.

\* See *Defence before the Presbytery*, p. 80.



That we may not be accused in our turn of bringing forward "unfounded accusations," and thus imposing upon Dr. Beecher the necessity of further explanations, we will proceed to adduce evidence of the inconsistencies and contradictions to which we have alluded. The first subject discussed in his *Views in Theology* is Natural Ability; but we shall pass this topic for the present, and commence with the more important one of Original Sin. This doctrine is universally admitted to be fundamental to the Calvinistic system. He who denies this doctrine, as taught in our confession of faith, and in the writings of the reformers, however good Christian he may be, cannot be a good Calvinist; a logical necessity is laid upon him to abandon most of the distinctive peculiarities of the Calvinistic system. If there be one doctrine which lies more broadly than any other at the base of this system, this is that doctrine; and if this be removed, the whole structure must fall. It might naturally be supposed, therefore, that every professed Calvinist would have his opinions on this subject so well settled and defined, that he would not be blown about by every wind of doctrine, or when discussing it at different times, express himself in contradictory terms. The Pelagian and Calvinistic views of the effect of the fall of man upon the race, are so luminously distinct from each other, and they touch too upon so many points of the respective systems to which they belong, that he who makes it doubtful which of these views is his own, cannot, assuredly, escape the just censure of paltering in a double sense, save under the plea of incredible ignorance. How far any of these remarks apply to the case before us, our readers will judge for themselves, after reading the extracts which we are about to adduce.

We will first exhibit the opinions which Dr. Beecher held on the subject of original sin, previous to his impeachment and trial. In his second lecture on, "The causes and remedy of scepticism," we find the following passage. "The points to which I allude, as violated by a false philosophy, are the principles of personal identity, by which the posterity of Adam are distinct from or confounded with their ancestor, and the principles of personal accountability and desert of punishment, as men are made accountable and punished for his conduct, or become liable to misery as a universal consequence. The nature of sin and holiness, considered as material qualities, or the substance of the soul, or as instincts, or as the spontaneous action of mind under moral govern-

ment, in the full possession of all the elements of accountability." It is very evident which of the opposite principles here stated the author adopts as his own. Any one who was acquainted with the theological controversies on this subject, would be led to suppose, in reading this passage, that Dr. Beecher meant to condemn, as false philosophy, the opinion that men are in any sense held responsible for the sin of Adam, or punished on account of it, and to maintain in opposition to this philosophic dogma of the dark ages, that all the sin and misery which men suffer, is merely the consequence of Adam's transgression. Now this true philosophy of Dr. Beecher would not be objected to by most Pelagians. They would admit that we are involved in misery by the fall of Adam,—one main hinge upon which the whole controversy turns is, whether this misery is punitive or not in its character. But punishment for Adam's sin, according to the apparent meaning of the above extract, is a figment of that false philosophy which has been employed for the exposition of the Calvinistic system, and which, in Dr. Beecher's deliberate opinion, "has done more to obstruct the march of Christianity, and to paralyze the saving power of the gospel, and to raise up and organize around the church the unnumbered multitude, to behold, and wonder, and despise, and perish, than all other causes beside."

In the other sentence of the passage quoted, the false philosophy of the nature of sin and holiness is that which considers them "as material qualities, or the substance of the soul, or as instincts," and he admits no alternative to this view, save that which restricts them to "the spontaneous action of mind under moral government." This is the very language of the New Haven school. The mode of stating the question leaves us in about as much doubt as to the theology of the writer, as we should feel respecting the political opinions of one who should assert that the parties to the controversy which has been for some years waged in our country, were the people on the one side, and the bank monster on the other. Whenever we see a statement of the question touching the nature of sin and holiness, which assumes that there is no intermediate ground between the theory that restricts them to acts, and that which supposes them to be physical entities infused into the mind, or created instincts of the soul, we are at no loss to name the banner under which the writer, however disguised, is doing battle upon the theological arena. It would be strange, indeed, if a Calvinist,

in enumerating the true and false theories upon this subject, should omit the only one which is consistent with the doctrine of our standards respecting the corrupt and sinful nature which we inherit from our fallen parent; and not the less strange, if in giving what he intended to be the orthodox account of this matter, he should so broadly misrepresent and caricature it, as to make it absurd and repulsive. If we were compelled to choose between making sin a material property or adjunct of the soul, or limiting it to the spontaneous action of the mind, we certainly would choose the latter, since it is impossible to state the other opinion in terms that are not self-contradictory; but we would choose it with the distinct understanding, that it compelled us to abandon the Calvinistic system. It is not, in our view, more absurd to hold that sin is a material substance, than to maintain that sin is confined to the spontaneous action of the mind, and in connexion with this, that man inherits a sinful nature.—The first proposition is absurd, because there is an essential opposition of meaning between sin and substance; the other two, in their conjunction, are no less absurd, because a nature is not in any sense an act, and, of course, by the previous definition, cannot be sinful.

Is it wonderful then, when Dr. Beecher comes forward, lisping the very shibboleth of the New Haven school, teaching that all who do not restrict the nature of sin to spontaneous acts of the mind, believe in physical depravity, that he should be considered as having abandoned the Calvinistic doctrine of original sin? Ought he to complain of his brethren because they were not willing to charge upon him the monstrous absurdity of believing that a nature is an act, and may therefore be sinful? And what shall be thought of the modesty of the man, who, having printed such sentiments, has the face to declare to the world that the accusations against him are groundless, and in the plenitude of his compassion, to beg the court before which he is tried, that they will not punish his prosecutor as a slanderer?

Our next extracts shall be taken from Dr. Beecher's sermon on the "Native Character of Man." In this sermon he makes the following assertions. "Neither a holy, nor a depraved nature are (is) possible, without understanding, conscience, and choice. To say of an accountable creature, that he is depraved by nature, is only to say, that rendered capable by his Maker of obedience, he disobeys from the commencement of his accountability." "A depraved nature can no more exist without voluntary agency and accounta-



bility, than a material nature can exist, without solidity and extension." "If, therefore, man is depraved by nature, it is a voluntary and accountable nature which is depraved, exercised in disobedience to the law of God." "Native depravity then, is a state of the affections, in a voluntary accountable creature, at variance with divine requirement, from the beginning of accountability." "The entireness of human depravity consists, therefore, in the constant, voluntary refusal of man to love the Lord his God with supreme complacency and good-will." All this seems to be sufficiently explicit. There is no obscurity to occasion a doubt as to the author's meaning. The terms used are such as are commonly employed in the discussion of this subject, and the statements are all so clear and precise, that no commentary is needed to educe or illustrate their meaning. We doubt whether the writings of the New Haven divines could furnish an equal number of sentences, which more completely deny the actual or possible existence of a depraved nature in man prior to moral action.

Of this famous sermon, Dr. Beecher has, however, given a still more famous explanation. It was written, he says, with the view of refuting the error which claims, as moral excellencies, the various amiable qualities and kindly feelings which are found in unregenerate men, and thus undermines the doctrine of man's total depravity. At least this is one account of the object he had in view in writing the sermon; for we shall presently show that he has given a different one. In refuting the error above named, he contends that as he had no occasion to speak of any thing but actual sin, all that he says should be applied only to adult man. The substance of his defence, on this ground, consists, therefore, in interpolating the words actual and adult before depravity in all the passages where it occurs. This is so extraordinary an explanation of the matter, that we feel really embarrassed to know how to deal with it. There are some things so plain that they cannot be made plainer; there are explanations and arguments sometimes adduced in the course of discussion which are so foreign to the subject that nothing can be done with them but to declare that they are impertinent. Even thus is it with this defence of Dr. Beecher; we despair of being able to illustrate its incongruity to any one who does not at once perceive it. Because the primary object of the writer was not to discuss the subject of original sin, is it therefore certain that this subject would not be incidentally

alluded to? Is it considered a sound rule of interpretation to endeavour to ascertain what was the author's main design, and then to assume that every word has strict reference to this one subject? This is, in effect, what Dr. Beecher claims on his own behalf. "The sermon," he says, "was not designed to have any reference to original sin; it spake only of the present actual condition of adult mind; the question how man came into such a state was not so much as touched." Throughout the whole of his defence of this sermon there is an assumption that no part of it includes or refers to any thing beyond his original design in writing it.\* There is no argument beyond this assumption to show that the passages objected to do not teach what they have been supposed to teach. Because he did not intend to discuss the question how man came into his present state, therefore this question was not touched, though there are the passages in which, according to the common understanding of the English language, he has not only touched it, but decided that the present condition of man is owing to his voluntary disobedience. Because he designed to prove in the sermon that all men are actual transgressors, therefore whenever he speaks of depravity we must prefix the qualifying term, adult, no matter with what confusion of grammar or sense. The design and drift of a writer ought indeed to be consulted in interpreting obscure passages, and should decide the question between two doubtful meanings. But we have never before met with any one who would carry this canon of exegesis so far as to pervert entirely the ordinary construction and force of words, for the sake of accommodating them to the one main argument of the writer. The subject of original sin is so far germane to that of actual transgression, that we should not be surprised to see it alluded to by the most logical writer upon total depravity, and in attempting therefore to discover the meaning of any passage in his discourse, we should be guided by the most obvious signification of the terms employed. And surely there can be no doubt what is the most obvious meaning of the passages we have quoted from Dr. Beecher. They are so plain, that if his explanation of them is admissi-

\* Bishop Berkley wrote a treatise, called *Siris*, which had for its professed object to make known the healing virtues of tar-water, but in the course of which he goes into a discussion of the ancient philosophy, the harmonies of the universe, the nature of virtue, &c. Allowing him the same latitude which Dr. Beecher claims, he might insist upon his right to insert tar-water before virtue wherever it occurs.

ble, we must abandon language as the means of communicating ideas, and invent some less dubious method. If a "depraved nature" means actual transgression, then black may mean white, and square may mean round, and root may mean branch, and language may be thrown aside as less explicit than dumb signs.

Let us take one of these sentences and try Dr. Beecher's explanation upon it. "Neither a holy nor depraved nature is possible without understanding, conscience, and choice." In his Defence he interprets this to mean, that "neither a holy nor depraved nature, *in respect to actual depravity*, is possible." There is no difficulty in understanding the first of these assertions. By a depraved nature in man, all the world understand that disposition or bent of mind by which he is inclined to evil, and which is the source of all actual transgression. The declaration that such a nature is impossible, without understanding, reason, and choice, can only mean that depravity cannot be affirmed of man until he has reached the period at which personal accountability commences; and this is well known to be one of the prevalent theories upon this subject; and these are the very terms in which that theory is generally announced by those who confessedly hold it. But we are utterly at a loss to divine the meaning of the phrase "a depraved nature, in respect to actual depravity." If the term actual is used in the sense of real, as opposed to imaginary, then it would seem to teach that the depravity which exists prior to moral action is only a kind of metaphysical fiction, holding the same sort of relation to the truth that the square root of a negative quantity does to a real expression in algebra. If he uses the word actual as opposed to potential, and means to distinguish between a depraved nature *in esse* and *in posse*, we must deny the correctness of the distinction. A depraved nature is itself the potential existence of actual transgression. Had it been Dr. Beecher's intention merely to teach that all actual sin is voluntary, it would have been very easy for him to have expressed this idea; but we cannot understand how the extracts which we have given can be made to convey it, however modified they may be by the expletives, actual and adult. The original garment refuses to receive these heterogeneous patches.

We have said that Dr. Beecher has given two different accounts of his object in writing this sermon. One of them we have already given, the other is contained in the following extract from his Defence: "The question was as to the



voluntariness of the depravity of an adult man. Keep this in remembrance, and then let me explain the drift of that sermon. After proving that the depravity of man is very great, I proceed in the sermon to say that it is voluntary, and this doctrine I advance in opposition to the philosophy which represents the existence of a great black pool somewhere behind the will; I don't know how big, but which continually pours out its waters of death—waters which turn the will as if it were a mill-wheel attached to some sort of patent model, which is continually working out sin. . . . . The doctrine I meant to oppose was that of a physical, natural, constitutional depravity, totally involuntary; and as instinctive as the principle which teaches a robin to build her nest, or a lion to eat flesh and not grass. Against this notion of instinctive depravity, leading men of necessity to do nothing but sin, I composed the sermon, in which I declare that the depravity of man, implied in his destitution of religion, is voluntary," &c. We have no objection to this account of the matter, save that it is inconsistent with the one previously given. If the sermon were written to counteract the notion that men are partially holy on account of their natural amiableness, it seems to us that this by-play with the black-pool and robin red-breast theories of the will is quite as foreign to the topic as a touch at original sin would have been. Dr. Beecher has, however, just as good a right to quarrel with this great big black pool, as Don Quixotte had to fight with the windmill. And if he should see fit to exercise this right, we cannot find it in our hearts to blame him; we can only express our wonder that a man of his undoubted strength should expend it in beating the air, or in creating a big black pool, and then splashing in its dirty waters only to his own defilement. Dr. Beecher is not too old to learn. He has recently discovered, to his great amazement, that the doctrine of free agency, which he had previously thought was the product of New England wisdom, has been held in all ages of the church in connexion with the Calvinistic system. Yet it was upon this very point that he was formerly in the habit of breaking out into the most copious expressions of horror over the evils produced by that false philosophy which had been employed for the exposition of Calvinism. We have no doubt that he has since sincerely repented the injustice of which he has thus been guilty towards others, and regretted the loss of his own time which, as he has now discovered, was wasted in contending with shadows. And as

he is now upon the right track, he will probably soon discover that there are other forms of that false philosophy which he has attributed to old Calvinists, that are, in truth, nothing more than the spectra of his own distempered fancy.

We cannot see how this second account of the object of the sermon sheds any light upon the passages which we have quoted from it. Let us again take one of these extracts, and see whether there is the least relevancy in the explanation. "To say of an accountable creature that he is depraved by nature, is only to say, that, rendered capable by his Maker of obedience, he disobeys from the commencement of his accountability." This, by itself, seems sufficiently plain. It is the precise account which Prof. Fitch gave of man's depravity in his sermon on the "Nature of Sin," and which has since been repeatedly given from the New Haven school. It could hardly be made more definite than it is. And we do not see that it receives the least illustration from the author's information, that his object in writing the sermon was to drain off the big black pool which some explorers have found lying back of the will, or that his aim was to describe the depravity of adult man. He speaks here of the depravity which is by nature, and, as plainly and forcibly as words can do it, he excludes from it every thing but actual disobedience.

The difficulty under which Dr. Beecher felt himself to labour in his defence, will be further perceived in the claim which he, with apparent seriousness, puts forward, that in this very sermon he does teach and establish the doctrine of original sin. And how? Why, "by proving two of the fundamental doctrines always relied on by the orthodox church, and by Edwards in particular, to prove the doctrine of original sin,—I mean the doctrine of total depravity, and the doctrine of regeneration." Verily the narrow portals of the Calvinistic platform must be widened, if all who teach total depravity and regeneration are to be therefore considered as good believers in our doctrine of original sin. Upon this principle, it would seem if a man agrees with us in any one fact or doctrine, we are to assume that he agrees with us in all our inferences from it. Dr. Taylor believes and teaches that all men are sinners, that the first moral act, and all the successive acts of every man, until he is renewed, are sinful. He has urged this point quite as strenuously as Dr. Beecher. Are we therefore to conclude that Dr. Taylor believes the doctrine of original sin as taught in our standards? We are

astonished and grieved when we see a man of Dr. Beecher's high standing engaged in the attempt to palm off such wretched sophistry—it hardly deserves so respectable a name—upon the Presbyterian church.

Dr. Beecher further asserts, that in one of the very passages “claimed to deny original sin, he does expressly allude to and recognize its existence as a reality.” Our readers will doubtless be curious to know what he considers a recognition of this doctrine. We quote the passage which contains it. “Whatever effect, therefore, the fall of man may have had on his race, it has not had the effect to render it impossible for man to love God religiously; and whatever may be the early constitution of man, there is nothing in it, and nothing withheld from it, which renders disobedience unavoidable and obedience impossible.” There can never be any lack of believers in the doctrine of original sin, if the vague, negative allusions, “whatever effect the fall of man may have had on his race,” and, “whatever may be the early constitution of man,” are to be considered a sufficient profession of faith. Who can withhold his sympathy from Dr. Beecher, in the affliction which he must have felt, when compelled to resort to such means as this to prove his orthodoxy? There is not a Pelagian or Socinian in the land, who might not, with perfect consistency, have uttered this sentence; and he must have felt himself hard pressed before he could have been driven so far to trifle with the public, and with his own character, as to allege it in proof of his recognition of the doctrine of original sin.

We have one more extract from Dr. Beecher's writings which we shall produce in evidence of his opinions on this subject prior to his trial. We solicit special attention to this passage, since its explicitness will be seen, if examined, to preclude all evasion and subterfuge. Through some neglect or oversight, which we deeply regret, it was not produced upon his trial. Had it been, we see not how the synod could have avoided convicting Dr. Beecher of having denied the doctrine of the confession of faith upon this point. The passage occurs in the controversy in which Dr. Beecher was engaged with the editor of the *Christian Examiner*, in the year 1828.\* It is in the following words.

“The reformers also, with once accord, taught that the sin of Adam was imputed to all his posterity, and that a corrupt

\* See *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, vol. 1. p. 158.



nature descends from him to every one of his posterity, in consequence of which infants are unholy, unfit for heaven, and justly exposed to future punishment. Their opinion seems to have been, that the very substance or essence of the soul was depraved, and that the moral contamination extended alike to all its powers and faculties, insomuch that sin became a property of every man's nature, and was propagated as really as flesh and blood. . . . . Our Puritan fathers adhered to the doctrine of original sin, as consisting in the imputation of Adam's sin, and in a hereditary depravity; and this continued to be the received doctrine of the churches of New England until after the time of Edwards. He adopted the views of the reformers on the subject of original sin, as consisting in the imputation of Adam's sin, and a depraved nature transmitted by descent. But after him, this mode of stating the subject was gradually changed, until long since, the prevailing doctrine in New England has been, that men are not guilty of Adam's sin, and that depravity is not of the substance of the soul, nor an inherent or physical quality, but is wholly voluntary, and consists in the transgression of the law, in such circumstances as constitutes accountability and desert of punishment."

Here at least, if never before, Dr. Beecher, to use one of his own expressions, is "fairly out," upon the subject of original sin. It is impossible to read this passage, and then doubt what his opinions were at the time he wrote it. Will he pretend that he was merely giving what was the prevalent doctrine in New England, and not stating his own views? The connexion in which this passage occurs precludes such a plea. The controversy which he was waging, was occasioned by a note to his sermon on the Moral Government of God, in which he had denied that the Calvinistic scheme involved the opinion that infants are damned. The editor of the *Christian Examiner* replied to this note; and Dr. Beecher, in his letter to him complains bitterly, that in maintaining his argument that Calvinists hold the offensive opinion in question, he makes use of exploded representations on the subject of original sin, instead of taking those which he knew were then generally adopted in New England. Dr. Beecher, therefore, was certainly guilty of duplicity in seeking to obtain for himself, what he deemed the benefit of these modified views of original sin, if he did not really hold them. But there is no doubt, there can be none, that he is here stating his own opinions. Were there any, it would be re-

moved by the following passage, which is found in close connexion with the one above quoted. "The pamphlets and treatises on this subject were written, and the subject settled before my recollection. But I have read them, and have searched the scriptures, and have, from the beginning, accommodated my phraseology to opinions which had been adopted as the result of an investigation which commenced more than seventy years ago, and has been settled more than fifty years." Dr. Beecher here declares, that the opinions which he had just presented, on the subject of original sin, were his own, that he had adopted them after careful study, and that he had preached them from the beginning.

Will he urge that he is here speaking of actual, or adult depravity? We should feel that we were unjust towards Dr. Beecher, in intimating the possibility of his resort to such grounds of defence, were it not for the specimen which he has already given of his wonderful capabilities in this line. But all the changes which he can ring upon the words, actual and adult, will not help him here. He is, in this part of his letter, professedly giving what he deems the true view of original sin, in opposition to the old Calvinistic doctrine, from which his adversary had drawn some of his arguments. It is then of infants, not adults, that he is writing;—it is of a depraved nature, existing prior to moral action, in distinction from whatever it is that he means by "a depraved nature, in respect to actual depravity."

Assuming what cannot be questioned, that this passage contains Dr. Beecher's views of original sin, it suggests several very obvious reflections. We see that Dr. Beecher, here, as in his other writings, misrepresents and caricatures the orthodox doctrine, that doctrine which he admits was generally held from the time of the reformation until after Edwards. After stating correctly the doctrine which they taught, he adds his own version of it in these words, "that the very substance or essence of the soul was depraved." And in giving an account of the change which had taken place in the mode of stating the subject, he makes the negative part of it to consist in the denial "that men are guilty of Adam's sin, and that depravity is of the substance of the soul, or an inherent or physical quality." This, then, was the doctrine which had been previously taught by Edwards, and his predecessors. But he otherwise represents their doctrine as teaching that "a corrupt nature descends from Adam

to every one of his posterity," or that "original sin consists in the imputation of Adam's sin, and in a hereditary depravity," or "a depraved nature transmitted by descent." Let it then be distinctly marked, and held in remembrance, that when Dr. Beecher rails at physical depravity, he means hereditary depravity;—when he attacks the opinion that the substance or essence of the soul is depraved, his shafts are levelled against the doctrine of a corrupt nature descending from Adam to his posterity. We have often been much perplexed in the attempt to understand what is meant by certain men, when they declaim against physical depravity, material sin, &c.; and we have sometimes been uncharitable enough to think that they had no meaning at all, and made use of these phrases merely to round a sentence or point an antithesis. But Dr. Beecher makes his meaning sufficiently plain. He uses physical depravity, and a depraved nature transmitted by descent, as convertible phrases;—and he leaves no halting place between the theory that depravity consists in a voluntary action, and that which makes it a physical quality. If this is done ignorantly,—if Dr. Beecher is really unable to perceive the difference between the orthodox doctrine of a corrupt nature, and that of a moral depravity in the physical structure of the soul, then he ought certainly to lay aside the office and the air of an instructor of his brethren in theology. But if the misrepresentation is made wilfully, we will venture to recommend to him the same discipline which he once advised in a similar case, the careful study of the ninth commandment. We are willing, however, in the present instance, to endure the pain of this evil report of our opinions, and even feel grateful to Dr. Beecher on account of it, because of the key which it furnishes to the passages in which he fulminates against physical depravity, and those who hold and teach it.

We were moreover struck, while reading this passage, with the wonderful similarity between its statements, and those already quoted from the sermon on the Native Character of Man. It is truly surprising that there should be such a strong likeness, a perfect identity indeed, between the two, when we consider that in the one he is describing actual depravity, or adult depravity, or a depraved nature in respect to actual depravity, and in the other, that depravity which belongs to original sin. Speaking of a depraved nature in respect to actual depravity, he says, "if, therefore, man is depraved by nature, it is a voluntary and accountable



nature which is depraved, exercised in disobedience to the law of God;"—and speaking of a depraved nature in respect to original sin, he says, "depravity is wholly voluntary, and consists in the transgression of the law in such circumstances as constitutes accountability and desert of punishment." We may surely be pardoned the natural error of supposing, that in these sentences he was describing the same thing. Especially do we think we may be forgiven this offence, when it is further observed that he uses the same phrases, native depravity, depraved nature, &c., in the one case to denote actual depravity, and in the other that which is not actual. And yet further would we plead in extenuation of our error, that Dr. Beecher informs us in this letter, that the views which it presents of original sin were those which he had held from the beginning, and to which he had always accommodated his phraseology. What, then, could have been more natural than for us to suppose, when we found in this letter a certain assertion made respecting "native depravity," and then found the same assertion respecting "native depravity," in a sermon written previously, that they both had reference to the same thing. If we have, indeed, erred in this supposition, we must pronounce it hazardous to attempt to interpret any production of Dr. Beecher, until he has first been tried for it, and had an opportunity to put in his explanation and defence.

Our last remark upon this exposition of the doctrine of original sin is, that the author himself cannot have the hardihood to deny that it is in direct conflict with the confession of faith. He expressly rejects the doctrine, whatever it was, which had been taught by the reformers, the Puritan fathers of New England, and by Edwards, and it has never been denied or doubted that the doctrine which they taught is that of our confession. He denies that men are guilty of Adam's sin, and thus rejects the doctrine of imputation. He asserts that all depravity is voluntary, and consists in the transgression of the law, discarding, as plainly as language can do it, the doctrine of a depraved nature transmitted from Adam to his posterity. Yet this doctrine, thus discredited, and contemptuously given over to the tender mercies of his Socinian adversary, is the doctrine of our standards. He does not simply modify the orthodox mode of stating this doctrine, he altogether rejects the doctrine itself. In a passage following the one we have given, he says, "These (the New England divines), while they disclaim the language held by Calvin

and Edwards on the subject of imputation, do, in accordance with the Bible and the reformers, teach that there is a connexion of some kind between the sin of Adam and the universal, voluntary, and entire depravity of his posterity; so that it is in consequence of Adam's sin that all mankind do sin voluntarily, as early as they are capable of accountability and moral action." This restriction of the whole matter to "a connexion of some kind" between Adam and his posterity, in consequence of which they all sin voluntarily as soon as they become capable of moral action, does more than discard our mode of representing the doctrine of original sin, as consisting in the imputation of Adam's sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of man's whole nature. By denying that we are in any sense guilty of Adam's sin, and rejecting the idea of a corrupt nature transmitted by descent, while it confines all depravity to actual transgression, it removes the whole ground of distinction between original and actual sin. It is mere quibbling, or something worse, to retain the phrase, when every thing that could be meant by it has been rejected. Besides actual transgression, Dr. Beecher teaches that there is nothing but "a connexion of some kind" existing between Adam and his posterity. But he certainly cannot contend for the absurdity of applying the term original sin to this connexion. Sin denotes something in the subject, not out of him. The phrase cannot be applied to the connexion itself, nor are we at liberty to affix it to the effect of this connexion upon the subjects of it, for this, he assures us, is actual transgression, not original sin. He believes that accountability does not "commence from the womb," and that the time when it does commence "is not and cannot be exactly known to any but the eye of God." Previous to this period, upon his theory, nothing more can be affirmed of the infant than that, in consequence of the sin of Adam, it is certain that it will sin voluntarily, as soon as it becomes capable of moral action. This is the utmost extent to which his doctrine can carry us; and what more gross misapplication of language is possible than to term this undefined connexion with Adam, or the certainty arising from it that the being will actually sin, original sin. This phrase should, in fairness, be thrown aside, if there can be no depravity or sin without "a transgression of the law under such circumstances as constitute accountability and desert of punishment." We should despair of being able to construct a categorical denial

of every semblance of the doctrine of original sin, if this be not one.

We expressed regret that the passage upon which we have been commenting had not been produced in evidence upon the trial, but we recall this expression. We doubt whether such regret is consistent with the proper degree of kindly feeling towards Dr. Beecher. No friend of his, who has beheld the pitiable plight to which he was reduced by the extracts that were brought forward from his sermon, the hopeless conflict in which he felt himself compelled to struggle with the obvious meaning of his words, and the wandering mazes of confusion and nonsense in which he was lost, can desire that his calamity should have been so much increased as it must have been had this passage been produced.

When it is considered that out of the little that Dr. Beecher had published which touched at all upon controverted points in theology, there was so much that denied the doctrine of original sin—that his sermons and conversation were said, by many competent judges who were in the habit of hearing them, to contain much more to the same effect—that he had declared, in his letter to Dr. Porter, that there were some things in which he agreed with Dr. Taylor—and that it was publicly known that during the controversy between Dr. Taylor and Dr. Tyler, in the *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, either as the *locum tenens* of the editor, or in some other capacity, he acted as second to Dr. Taylor—is it wonderful, when these things are considered, that Dr. Beecher should have been more than suspected of heresy? Were the accusations against him so entirely groundless, that he is entitled to assume the attitude and tone of an injured man? Truly, we think the merchant or physician who had given as much reason for suspicion of his honesty or his skill, however aged, might not only be justly called upon to exhibit his books, or give an account of his cases and practice, but that he ought to esteem himself fortunate if he escaped conviction of fraud, or quackery, and humbly resolve to amend his course, instead of censuring those who had called him to an account.

We will now take up Dr. Beecher's *Views in Theology*, and seek to ascertain what opinions he there avows on the subject of original sin. And here we find an account so different, so diametrically opposed to that which he had previously given, that we can hardly believe them to have proceeded from the same pen.\* The voice that we hear is no

\* We have indeed heard it said, that after the publication of his *Views in The-*



longer the exulting tone of one proclaiming new and important truths in theology; it sounds like an echo from the tomb of the dead and buried orthodoxy of the reformers and the Puritan fathers. Let the following extract be compared with those which we have given from his previous writings.

"What the precise errors are which I am supposed to hold I do not know; but from the evidence relied on, and the general course of the argument, it would seem that I am supposed to hold the Pelagian doctrine on the subject (original sin); that I deny that Adam was the federal head and representative of his race; that the covenant was made not only with Adam, but also with his posterity; that the guilt of his sin was imputed to them; that there is any such thing as native depravity; or that infants are depraved. That, on the contrary, I hold and teach that infants are innocent, and as pure as Adam before the fall; and that each one stands or falls for himself as he rises to personal accountability; and that there is no such thing as original sin descending from Adam by ordinary generation; and that original sin is not sin, or in any sense deserving God's wrath and curse.

"Now *every one* of these assumed errors of my faith I *deny to be my faith*. They ascribe to me opinions which I have never held or taught, and, as I shall show, there is no evidence that I ever taught *one* of them."

This confession leaves us nothing to desire on this subject. The most orthodox cannot go beyond it. Translated from its present negative into the equivalent positive form, it would read thus. "I hold and teach, that Adam was the federal head and representative of his race; that the covenant was made not only with Adam, but also with his posterity; that the guilt of his sin was imputed to them; that there is such a thing as native depravity, and that infants are depraved. I hold and teach that infants are guilty; that they are already fallen, before they rise to personal accountability; that there is such a thing as original sin, descending from Adam by ordinary generation; and that original sin is properly sin, and deserving of God's wrath and curse."

ology, Dr. Beecher, as if doubtful of his own identity, sought to assure himself by going on to New Haven and ascertaining whether Dr. Taylor would recognize him. It is added, that the result of the experiment was entirely satisfactory. But this story must be apocryphal. We can readily conceive that Dr. B. might feel himself in the predicament of Amphitryon when he exclaimed,

Num formam perdidit? mirum quin me norit Sosia.

Serutabor: eho dic mihi, quis videor? num satis Amphitruo?

But the incredible part of the story is that Sosia recognized Amphitryon.

Those who are acquainted with the controversies to which the subject of original sin has given rise, will at once perceive how explicitly this confession meets and rejects every error that has at any time prevailed. We have never seen, within the same compass, so close and strict a statement of the doctrine, one which so fully yielded all that the orthodox demand, and so carefully guarded against every thing to which they object. We do not believe that there is upon record a Calvinistic statement of this doctrine, which adds any thing which is not included in the view that Dr. Beecher here presents as his own. It would have been entirely satisfactory, therefore, and we should have rejoiced in it beyond measure, if in connexion with this profession of his faith, he had made a recantation of his former errors. Or we would have been satisfied with the virtual recantation, implied in this profession, if he had not seen fit to accompany it with the express declaration, "such, on the subject of original sin, are the views which I have always held and taught since I have been in the ministry." Again, he says, "my doctrinal opinions have been unchanged from the beginning." And yet again, "in doctrine I am what I have ever been." These declarations are the source of our perplexity and our misgivings. Here he declares, that ever since he has been in the ministry he has held and taught, "that original sin descends from Adam to his posterity, by ordinary generation," or, as he again expresses it in another passage, that "it descends from Adam, by natural generation to all his race." But in his letter to the editor of the *Christian Examiner*, he informs us, that he has from the beginning adopted those opinions of original sin which reject the idea presented by the reformers, "of a depraved nature, transmitted by descent." Here he professes to believe, "that the guilt of Adam's sin is imputed to his posterity;" in his letter he states his opinion to be, "that men are not guilty of Adam's sin." Here he affirms that "it (original sin) is involuntary;"\* in his letter he declares that there is no depravity save that which is "wholly voluntary." Here he teaches that infants are guilty, before they rise to personal accountability, and deserving God's wrath and curse; in his letter he tells us that there is no depravity or guilt, but that which arises from "the transgression of the law under such circumstances as constitute accountability and desert of punishment." Here he says of original sin, that "it is denominated by Edwards,

\* See *Views in Theology*, p. 193.

and justly, an exceedingly evil and depraved nature;”\* in his letter he declares that he has always repudiated the views and language of Edwards upon this subject.

Here is contradiction palpable and broad. The two views presented by Dr. Beecher in his earlier and his later publications, belong to two entirely different, two opposite systems. They have no common points of resemblance, and the same man can no more hold the two simultaneously in his faith, than he can believe both in the Ptolemaic and the Copernican system of the universe. Yet Dr. Beecher assures us again and again that he has never changed in doctrine; that he has always taught that native depravity is voluntary, and always taught that native depravity is involuntary. We know not which way to turn for a solution of this paradox. We are unwilling to believe that Dr. Beecher is so obtuse in his perception of truth, that he does not see the wide and bridgeless gulf between these two systems. We are reluctant, too, to believe that pride or false shame would keep him from acknowledging a change in his views, if himself conscious that such a change had taken place. And we would fain avoid the belief that in his orthodox professions, he uses words and terms in a different sense from that which he knows others will attach to to them, thus reserving to himself the liberty of retreat, under the shelter of the esoteric sense, to his former views, whenever the days of trial for heresy shall have passed by. We can conceive no other solution, save that which is afforded by one of these hypotheses;—but we are unwilling to choose between them, and will leave our readers, after this exhibition of the facts and the difficulties of the case, to form their own conclusion.

We regret, most sincerely and deeply, the result of our examination into Dr. Beecher's opinions. It is painful to bring forward such charges as are implied in the exhibition we have made, against one whom we are constrained on so many accounts to admire and respect. But truth and justice are superior in their claims to personal considerations; and we have felt, that under the peculiar circumstances of the case, they required this exposure at our hands.

The only other topic which we intended to make the subject of extended comment, is the theory which Dr. Beecher gives of the will, in his discussion of Natural Ability. But we have already occupied so much space that we must defer our remarks on this point to a future number.

\* See *Views*, p. 194.



ART. IV. — *A Discussion of the question, Is the Roman Catholic Religion, in any or in all its Principles or Doctrines, inimical to Civil or Religious Liberty? And of the question, Is the Presbyterian Religion, in any or in all its Principles or Doctrines, inimical to Civil or Religious Liberty?* By the Reverend John Hughes of the Roman Catholic Church, and the Reverend John Breckinridge of the Presbyterian Church. Philadelphia: Carey, Lea & Blanchard. 1836.

LOGICIANS tell us that the word *disputare*, from which we derive our word *dispute*, is a term of husbandry, metaphorically used to express a more elegant conceit. In its primary application it belongs to the vine-dresser, and it signifies cutting off the superfluous branches, that is, pruning. The disputant is supposed to be like the vine-dresser, "because he cutteth off all the idle and unnecessary curiosities of the question whereof there is no use in reasoning—severeth that which followeth from that which followeth not—order from confusion, and handleth diverse arguments in diverse places distinctly, not every thing in every place disorderly: and this metaphorical sense is now better known than the original signification." The logicians tell us again that "dialectics is the logic of dialogue, wherein, by question and answer, it may be known what each dialogist concedes and what he denies; and each denying only that which is false, and admitting all that is true and pertinent, the dialogue or dispute may be concluded *ex concessis*." The logicians, no doubt, are right in their etymologies, and the original notion of a dispute may be expressed accurately enough by this notation; but in our days most disputes, whether they relate to ethics or physics, theology or politics, are at best but imperfect examples of this logical process. Why it so happens, we shall not stop to inquire; we merely note the fact and remark upon it, that the artifices of which it is the result, form no small portion of the sophistry (or, as it is abusively called, the logic) of popular discussions; for, strange as it may seem to an ingenuous, truth-loving mind, there is, if we may adopt the dialect of some of our casuists, logic for the vulgar, as well as logic for the learned, the uses and the results of which differ as widely as do truth and error. These artifices are numerous and systematized, and, in the hands of a master, are often available to baffle a vigorous opponent, or, if not that, to cre-

ate an illusion upon the minds of those who cannot or do not examine closely the foundation and the structure of an argument. With some disputants it is a rule never to make any concession whatever, except upon collateral matters, from which no conclusion can be drawn in support of the main question. Nothing can be more simple in conception than this rule, but it requires some discretion in the use. A proposition may be so obviously true, or be sustained by evidence so convincing, and withal be so clearly and closely pertinent to the subject of controversy, that to deny it or dodge it, or even not to admit it, would be the triumph of the opponent. Such topics are like rocks or shoals in the mariner's course. They must be foreseen and avoided by a timely digression. To accomplish this sometimes requires all the finesse of the most astute sophist. His first essay towards the object, if we may judge from examples, is to try upon his opponent the effect of a decoy; if that *takes*, the end in view is usually compassed and the danger gracefully passed. To this head of the art are to be referred all "idle and unnecessary curiosities" adroitly connected with the question—the pertinacity so frequent about trifling words and phrases—and all long and impertinent excursions upon unimportant matters. In fact, the chief difficulty in dealing with an unfair disputant consists in confining him to the grounds of the question—in urging him upon the very horns of the controversy. Often it is impossible to do so, and it requires, in many cases, great powers of discrimination and of self-command to resist successfully his multiform arts and disingenuous practices. Yet the first duty of the defender of truth is, not to allow himself to be seduced or drawn from the ground he ought to occupy. No good in any case can be expected from it; and besides this, unless he constantly and clearly keeps in view the true points of controversy, and makes his readers or hearers also discern them, and resolutely and steadily bears down upon them, never turning aside even for a moment to refute that which does not belong to the question, he cannot reasonably hope to do his work effectually. But should he do so, still he will have other difficulties to encounter. An unfair debater who finds himself in such hands will turn his artillery from his opponent (while seeming to contend with him) upon his hearers. His effort will then be to decoy or confound them, and for this purpose the sophist, if astute, will be fore-armed. He will have "arsenals of equivocations, restrictions, and subtleties," stored in

the terms of the question—in definitions, conditions, the kinds of proofs admissible, or the like. There are few questions which cannot be proved by several arguments, or series of arguments differing in kind, although in effect equally conclusive. But the best arguments are simple and direct, founded, as far as may be, upon palpable visible facts, or such as address common observation and experience: and arguments of this kind should always be selected especially for a popular audience, for such only can carry conviction to the popular mind. Now one of the commonest arts of sophistry is to exclude such arguments in the manner hinted, or, if not, oppose them with learned disquisition in order thereby to create the impression, that the true and the only true grounds of the question are more remote than the grounds actually taken: for example, that they lie in history, or perhaps in the monuments of history, and far beyond the ken of any eye but that of the most practiced antiquarian and learned critic; or that they are to be found in the metaphysics, or in the forgotten dogmas of ancient sects, or at least in something quite remote from common observation and experience. When these or the like artifices are adopted, the advocate of the truth, though he may not be deceived himself, often finds it impossible to impart to his hearers or readers his own convictions. The predicament occurs in which the bias of preconceived opinions usually, or too often, inclines the judgment, if judgment it can be called, against the truth. “The doctors disagree,” and each pins his faith upon the sleeve of his own doctor, he knows not why.

A help to this result is the ardour and vehemence incident to oral debate. These naturally tend to produce some confusion of topics which it is easy for an artful man to convert to the confusion of the hearers. Each of the disputants is obliged to answer or reply as well as perform his own appropriate part of attack or defense, and when vehemently pressed he will naturally enough act the part of the swain in Virgil, who, for lack of an answer to a hard question, “stuck a fresh doubt upon the neck of it.” *Dic quibus in terris*, quoth Damoctas; *Dic quibus in terris*, retorts Moenaleus, claiming it as a victory to have given a blow for the blow he could not parry. This species of argument is quite as impressive upon some minds as any other. The logicians have invented an apt metaphor to describe it. The word is *debate*, and indeed it is more fitly borrowed from the pugilist than from



the vine-dresser: for no two things can be more different than a logical *dispute* and a *war of words*.

These observations have been suggested by a perusal of the book mentioned at the head of this article, not because we suppose them more pertinent to the discussion contained in it than they are to many others. How far they are applicable to this book, and how they should be applied, we leave to the judgment of those who shall read it. Our object at present is not to inculcate the rules of logic or of fair discussion. It may not be improper, nevertheless to throw out these few hints for the consideration of those whom inclination, necessity, or a sense of duty, may call to the rostrum. Nor is it our purpose to examine minutely the manner in which this particular controversy appears to have been conducted, or the force of the particular arguments on either side. The topics contained in it are so numerous that our limits would not allow even a cursory review of all of them. Several of them have been made the subject of separate treatises, and would require from us a volume instead of a few pages. Our concern is with the questions discussed, and we intend to use the book chiefly as a help to communicate some thoughts connected with a portion of its contents; but in so doing, we shall endeavour to give such examples of the argument and state of the discussion as will enable our readers to form a correct judgment of the ability with which the respective parts are maintained.

Generally, however, we will say that both of the reverend gentlemen concerned have displayed tact, talent, and learning, and withal a degree of zeal which sometimes transcends the limits of that charity which is not easily provoked. So it seems *in print*, and therefore, in the revision of the speeches for the press, some portions of the speeches might have been omitted without disadvantage. But, passing that, we are disposed to consider it a fortunate circumstance that the negative of the first of these questions devolved upon a gentleman of so much talent, sagacity, and learning, as the Rev. Mr. Hughes. The question probably had been maturely considered by him (though he appears to think it otherwise with his opponent), and the views of the clergy of his communion, both here and abroad, probably were not unknown to him, and there can be no doubt that he has constructed the most skilful argument which that side of the question admits. Such an argument was a *desideratum*. We have long been curious to know how a system which owes its chief develop-

ment to such men as Gregory VII., Innocent III., and Julius II., and which has for centuries been allied to monarchical states—a system which abounds in contrivances or adaptations which have respect to a civil establishment, and which, by its canons or jurisprudence, comes in contact with and affects to control almost all the social relations, can be fitted to our institutions so as to work harmoniously with them. Viewing, as we have been accustomed to do, the Roman Catholic church as the uncompromising enemy of the reformation, and American liberty as the first mature fruit of the reformation, this problem has always appeared to us impossible. Assuming this as a settled point, the question which next occurred to us was, how far that church would change her forms or her principles, for the sake of harmony with our institutions, or whether she would change at all? Have we any reason to suppose that the church of Rome will discard her long cherished doctrines of supremacy, of infallibility, of the divine right of her priesthood, and in their place incorporate into her symbols the grand tenet of the reformation, *namely*, liberty of conscience and freedom of worship, by the law of nature and of revelation, without obedience to her jurisdiction? Will that church still maintain that out of her pale there is no salvation? Or will she now at length acknowledge her error, and admit, with reference to the Protestant churches, that in every community of Christians in which the gospel is rightly taught, and its ordinances rightly administered, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him? (Acts 10: 34, 35.) The book does not encourage us to expect any such change, and the chief value of the portion of it just alluded to consists in its indications of the methods by which the European principles and policy of that church are to be maintained upon American ground.

We are aware that it is difficult, if not impossible, to treat the subject of this discussion without being thought uncharitable, and even “willing to affect injuriously by false testimony the Catholic body in their civil and religious rights.” We know that many of our Catholic citizens think it an injurious imputation to inquire or even doubt whether the system of religion which they profess can be made to harmonize with the highest degree of civil and religious liberty. But we are not conscious of any such motives, nor do we believe that we are unconsciously influenced by any such. We desire to hold, with respect to all men, the truth in love. We have reason to know that among our Catholic citizens may

be found many high-minded men—men who are not only good citizens, but ardent and devoted patriots. We rejoice in the fact; and while, as disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ, we lament their departure from the simplicity and truth of the gospel, as their fellow-citizens we regard them as really Protestants in their political principles. We believe that if times of trial should come their political principles would prevail over their religious errors, that they would rally with us in support of the great cause of civil and religious liberty. With such men we have no controversy, we desire none. We would rather win them to the cause of truth and righteousness. And upon the particular subject before us, we would rather that they should examine for themselves, with sobriety, candour, and care, those parts of their system which come in contact with the social relations. We feel persuaded the investigation would result in the conviction that their system must be modified in many important particulars before it can be made to harmonize with our institutions.

The question respects the *system*. We are admonished again and again by the book before us that the affirmative of the argument cannot be proven by the sayings and doings of popes, cardinals, canonists, or Catholic writers (see pp. 200, 202); and if that be so, then, for the same reason, the negative of the question cannot be proven by the sayings and doings of such men as the Carrolls, Lafayette, or Kosciusko (p. 208). The question, we repeat, regards the system of religion. What is its influence as a system? And upon this question we hold no wavering opinions. We believe it to be irreconcilable with civil and religious liberty. Let the *system*, in all its parts, as portrayed by Catholic theologians and canonists, be animated and put in action among us, and it would very soon utterly change our political and religious institutions. Is it an offence against charity to express this sentiment? What then should be said of the freedom which the devouter portion of the Roman Catholics use in respect to the religion of Protestants? In a former controversy between the same reverend gentlemen, the following sentiments were expressed by the Rev. Mr. Hughes. In No. 21 of that controversy he remarks, "If I were allowed to define the Protestant religion, I should call it the religion of free thinking about the meaning of the Bible—the religion in which every man has a right to judge for himself, and to make the sacred text of scripture speak in accordance with his judgment. . . . . The religion, in fine, which occupies the



intermediate space between ancient Christianity and *modern Deism*, combining certain elements of *both*, and cherishing enmity towards both (especially the *former*), and unable to defend itself against either: such, in my opinion, is the true definition of Protestantism." Again, in No. 25 of the same controversy, we learn from the same source, "that it is mere sophistry to assert that the Protestant religion is as old as the Bible. The Turk may say, with equal propriety, that his religion is as old as God himself." Are not such opinions a breach of charity? Are they not injurious to the Protestant body? Do they convey no imputation upon the religious principles of the framers of the American constitution? If the Protestants of the United States were a small body embosomed in a Roman Catholic community, would not such opinions tend to affect injuriously their civil and religious rights? But truth, it is said, is intolerant. It cannot admit error into a community of its rights. In reply, we ask, is it theological truth only that is intolerant? Is not truth which affects the civil and social relations of men also intolerant? If Protestants are right, may they not justify, by the same argument, their opinions of the tendency of the Roman Catholic religion? But what is the truth? Until this question be settled let no man justify intemperate zeal by the intolerance of truth. While we would make no apology for the truth, we ought to use no unnecessary harshness in declaring it. Christian principles require it; true policy (if we must allow weight to meaner motives) also requires it; kindness and candour will win their way through obstacles which cannot be forced. But it is time to introduce our readers to the book.

The first question discussed (and to that we shall confine this article) is expressed in the following terms; "Is the Roman Catholic religion, in any or all its principles or doctrines, opposed to civil or religious liberty." But what are doctrines? and what is a proof of doctrine? Upon turning to the definitions and conditions agreed to by the parties (at p. 7) we are informed "that religious doctrines are those tenets of faith and morals which a denomination teaches as having been revealed by Almighty God," and that "the decree of a general council, the bull or brief of a pope, or the admitted doctrines by a pope, shall be received as a proof of doctrines or principles on the one side, and the Westminster confession of faith, &c., on the other side."

We are sensible of the propriety of settling accurately the

limits of a question, by the use of unequivocal terms, or if that be impossible, by defining equivocal terms with as much exactness as language will admit. But if the intention of this question was to open the whole ground of the controversy, either it was not propounded in proper terms, or the discussion of it was unduly restricted in respect of allowable proofs. Catholicism, we are told, is a *fact*, and certainly its actual influence upon civil and religious liberty is a *fact*.

Why then should we confine the question to the influence or supposed influence of those abstract principles or doctrines which general councils or popes have formally taught as having been revealed by Almighty God? Let us admit for a moment that all the councils and all the popes have concurred in teaching as a doctrine "that the kingdom of Christ is not of this world." Are we sure that we understand the doctrine intended? May we not inquire what it is, "not to be of this world," according to the sense in which this doctrine has been uniformly understood by councils and the popes? And how can we learn this? May we expound the terms (the predicate) ourselves? Or must we look to the pope for exposition? or may we look to *the fact*? Obviously, we should think, the true guide to the *received* sense of the doctrine is the practice of the church; the sayings and doings of its visible head and of its priesthood, and the allowed principles and practices of the great body of its visible communion.

We object further to the terms of the question (if it was intended to present the true grounds of the actual controversy) because it excludes from the argument *defects of doctrine*, and shuts out of view a capital point in the policy of that church. In the early ages of the Christian church, and before the commencement of the temporal power of the popes, it was the custom of the churches to collect in symbols the fundamental doctrines of faith. Hence we have what is called the apostle's creed; also that of the council of Nice and the Athanasian creed. But neither the councils of the Roman Catholic church, nor the popes, have ever thought it consistent with the policy of the church to adopt a symbol or confession containing *all* the principles or doctrines of the Roman Catholic religion. We know not, therefore, what *all* the doctrines of that church are; but this we do know, that the Bible alone is not the rule of faith. It is the Bible and the pope, or the Bible and a general council together, which constitute the rule. Now so long as the living expositor

refers to his own breast instead of a fixed symbol for any portion of doctrine, we can neither know how large that unrevealed portion is, nor its import or bearing upon the interests or happiness of men. This omission to form a complete confession is designed to give, and in fact does give to the popes a power which may be used and which often has been used in subservience of their views of temporal policy. How important that power is, and how deeply and ingeniously it may be made to affect the liberties of men, is impressively taught by the history of the famous bull *Unigenitus*, fulminated by Clement XI. in 1713, and condemning certain doctrines advanced by Father Quesnil, a French priest, in a commentary upon the New Testament, published in 1699. The execution of this bull in France alone during the ministry of Cardinal Fleury, is said to have required fifty-four thousand *lettres de cachet*: that was the name given to the orders issued in the name of the king by one of his ministers for the arrest and imprisonment of his subjects.

But again, we hold that the system is as justly chargeable with its defects of doctrine as with its positive precepts. Under this head we might make many specifications: but one example is sufficient for illustration. The Roman Catholic religion does not teach that its own establishment by law and its alliance with the civil power is anti-scriptural and contrary to the mind and will of Christ, who taught that his kingdom was not of this world. It does not teach, as do several of the American constitutions, (cited by Dr. Breckinridge, at p. 34,) and as all truly Protestant churches teach that "*no man* can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or maintain any ministry against his consent." It does not teach that the ministry of the gospel is a ministry of persuasion merely. So far from it the history of that church demonstrates its doctrine to be the reverse. The world has had too much experience of systems not to know that negative provisions are often quite as important as positive precepts. So at least the founders of the American governments thought. In framing the article upon religious liberty, which enters into nearly all the American constitutions, they indulged a long retrospect. In the map which history had been delineating for nearly ten centuries, the invasion of priestly and princely power in different forms and under different names upon the rights which God has given to men, were marked with bold strokes



and glowing colours. This map was spread before them. It was not therefore the establishment of the church of England alone which they intended, though it was the intolerance of that church which they and their ancestors had chiefly felt. Their eye was doubtless upon all establishments of state religions, by which political power and policy seek to attain profane or secular ends through religion. The American Catholics of English and Irish descent could and no doubt did heartily concur in a provision which had an aspect to their immediate oppressors and to their own protection in a Protestant country; yet it was not by authority of any doctrine or principle taught by their church that they did so.

We repeat it then, the question is defectively stated, because it compels us to look at the system only through the medium of decrees, bulls and briefs. In order to form just conclusions upon all its various bearings upon civil society, we must look at the Roman Catholic religion as *a fact*; at its continued influence from the commencement of the temporal power of the popes as *a fact*; at its actual and continued influences upon civil and religious liberty as *facts*. Why may we not do so? The world is *a fact*; the history of the world is but a succession of *facts*; and this religion enters very largely into that history. That church has been contemporaneous with all the monarchies of modern Europe. She has been the teacher of almost all the emperors and kings which modern Europe has known; her ministers have had no small share in political affairs for ages. What has been the actual influence of her doctrines, her precepts, her practices? Where was civil and religious liberty at the reformation? Where is civil and religious liberty most fully enjoyed now? What has made the difference? These are facts. Why then send us to the decrees of councils, or to bulls, or briefs, or confessions of faith, for doctrines or proofs of doctrine? The facts are visible, palpable. They do not lie under the chair of St. Peter, nor within the covers of the Westminster confession of faith, but upon the surface of Christendom. Not that the terms of the question as restricted by definitions and conditions exclude *all* proof. Far from it. But they do exclude volumes of proof of the most impressive and convincing character, and in place of it we are required to form our judgment upon learned disquisitions about the authenticity of decrees or acts of council, verbal criticisms upon the text, the exposition of it and the

like. Now we venture to affirm that the public can never be brought to repose their judgment of the tendency of a system of religion upon any such proofs. How few are there among us that judge of the spirit of the religion of the false prophet by the Koran, and yet who does not know and believe it to be a cruel and fanatical religion? Common observation teaches that conduct is the fruit of principle. A *good* tree cannot bring forth *evil* fruit, neither can a *corrupt* tree bring forth *good* fruit. The analogy is not fanciful. (Matth. 7: 15, 20.) It is almost the necessary foundation of the popular judgment.

Mr. Hughes does not forego the advantages of his position. Thus (on pp. 199, 200,) we find the following remarks. "FIRST. What had he (Mr. Breckinridge) undertaken to prove? He had undertaken to prove, that there are doctrines in the Catholic religion which are hostile or opposed to civil and religious liberty. This is his proposition. As long as he does not prove *this proposition*, he beats the air. But what are we to understand by 'DOCTRINE?' Any '*tenet of faith or morals which Catholics hold as having been revealed by Almighty God.*' Consequently, the first step to be taken, is to select the 'DOCTRINE.' If it is admitted as such, then he has only to proceed with the argument. If, what he imputes as a 'DOCTRINE,' be denied by his opponent, then he must either abandon it, or show that it was taught in the acts of a general council, or the bull of a pope, 'AS A TENET OF FAITH OR MORALS THAT HAD BEEN REVEALED BY ALMIGHTY GOD.' When he has proven this, then he may again proceed to build his argument on it, notwithstanding the denial of his opponent.

"SECOND. His next duty, as a logician, is to show in what manner the 'DOCTRINE' is opposed to civil and religious liberty, according to the admitted definition of these words. If, instead of this, he trusts to popular prejudices in the minds of his audience, and substitutes declamation instead of logic, then he appeals to the tribunal of passion, and REASON will assuredly disclaim the verdict.

"THIRDLY. I shall now proceed to show wherein the 'FALLACIES' of the gentleman's argument consist. The foundations on which he builds, are the sayings and doings of popes, cardinals, canonists, and Catholic writers. Now, this is fundamentally illogical; for, there are many things *said*, and *written*, and *done*, by these, which are *not* Catholic doctrines. Thus the Interdict of Venice—does not

vidual man by God himself. So that he cannot *make* himself, or *be* made less free than God has made him in this respect. It is an essential element of his free agency, and indispensable to his voluntary worship, which *alone* is worship in truth."

Mr. Hughes, in reply (p. 46), asserts that "the action of the majority-principle is restricted by the sphere of the purely civil and social relations. It has nothing to do, with those 'natural and imprescriptible rights which lie *aback* of all conventions.' These belong to another category, and shall be treated of in their proper place. That the gentleman should have confounded them with *civil* and *social rights*, is the more surprising, as the constitution has expressly EXCEPTED THEM from the operation of the principle, which that same constitution has sanctioned, for the regulation of social rights; and this exception the gentleman has quoted, without seeming to comprehend its meaning. '*All men have a NATURAL and INDEFEASIBLE right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences,*' &c.

"Here are the rights which the constitution recognises, as *indefeasible* and *natural*—equally beyond the reach of the majority and minority. These, then, have no reference to the *civil* or *political* rights, secured by the national instrument in question, but to religious, spiritual rights, which are to be inviolable."

After considerably more comment upon Mr. Breckinridge's views, which we should be glad to extract if we had space, he proceeds thus: "Let us endeavour to introduce order into the chaos of his speculations. RIGHTS are *privileges either inherent in our nature, or derived from some extrinsic source. The former class are termed NATURAL, INDEFEASIBLE, imprescriptible and eternal.* The latter are classed under various heads;—those which are derived from God by revelation, are termed *divine rights*; those which result from the social compact, are called *civil* or *political rights*; when that compact secures us in the privilege of EXTERNALLY '*worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of our conscience,*' it guarantees our *religious rights*. The immunities of the standing which we hold in the ecclesiastical body to which we belong, are termed *our ecclesiastical rights*. Let us explain.

"1. NATURAL RIGHT. If every man were living by himself, having no connexion with his fellow-beings, he



would have a natural right to do whatever he chose, except only what God would have forbidden him, &c.

"2. DIVINE RIGHT. This is the authority with which God has invested certain men and conditions of life, for some purpose of good. Thus, Moses, after his appointment, had the *right* to command the people of God. The Jewish priesthood had the *right* to offer sacrifices. The apostles had the *right* to establish Christianity, and their legitimate successors have the right to perpetuate it, both by the preaching of the word and the administration of the sacraments. These rights are peculiar to those *only*, to whom God has given them, and in *this* they differ from *natural rights*, which are common to all men. Now *rights* and *duties* are correlative: and therefore it was the *duty* of the people of God to obey Moses, and it is the *duty* of men to hear (and practice) the doctrines of Christianity from those who have the *right* to preach them. This right is not derived from *nature*; neither is it, nor can it be, derived from civil authority. And consequently those who have not received the *divine* appointment to exercise it, do not possess it at all. The sphere, and direct object of this *right*, is spiritual. It is degraded by those who wield it for base, temporal purposes. 'My kingdom is not of this world.' The exercise of this *right* is no *usurpation*, except by those who did not receive it from God, and could not receive it from any other source.

"3. POLITICAL, OR CIVIL RIGHTS, are '*that residuum of NATURAL liberty which is not required by the laws of society to be sacrificed to public convenience; or else those civil privileges, which society has engaged to provide in lieu of those natural liberties so given up by individuals.*' This definition is from a Protestant jurist. It distinguishes properly between those *natural rights* which the laws of society do not require us to sacrifice, and those conventional rights which result from society itself.

"Finally: ECCLESIASTICAL RIGHTS are those privileges secured to individuals according to their stations, and resulting from the ecclesiastical constitution or usages of the religious society to which he belongs.

"Thus, Mr. President, you perceive that there are RIGHTS of various and distinct orders. That the application of those *rights* must be in the *order of the subjects* to which they are applicable, &c.

"These principles are so clear that they cannot be denied consistently with sense or reason. They are in the nature of

things, and constitute the pulse of civil and religious organization. The individual who would exempt himself from the discharge of either social or ecclesiastical duties, *as established in the state by lawful authority*, or in the religious body of which he is a member, by an appeal to his pretended natural rights would justly be regarded as unworthy to participate in the advantages of either," &c.

We turn now to Mr. Breckinridge. After commenting on the majority-principle, and the last paragraph extracted, he proceeds as follows:

"Now my principle is this: there are certain *rights* which no majority or minority can give or take away, or interfere with, except to prevent men, in their exercise, from invading the rights of other men. Of these, as most important, I selected, as a specimen of the rest, *the right of worship* which God confers on every man as a natural, indefeasible right. This right is sometimes called a *religious right*; but our admirable constitution justly regards it as a *civil right*: that is, though it refers to *religion*, it is a right belonging to man in civil society. The constitution does *not confer*, and no constitution can *take away* this right. It does not except it; but on the contrary adopts it, declares it, and secures it, as a civil right to all American citizens in the following noble language:—

"*All men,*" &c. But at Rome, in Spain, and in every Roman Catholic country upon earth, this is denied; and even in the Spanish American states, the *rights of conscience* are trampled in the dust. The gentleman himself also on the first evening took the same ground in substance, when he vested all *rights, civil and religious*, in the *majority*. Frightened by the consequences of his own principles, he has half receded and half retains this ground, in the last speech. It is indeed a curious offspring of a *Roman* conscience, trying to speak *American* principles. He denies, for example, that the majority-principle, as he calls it, has any thing '*to do with those natural and imprescriptible rights* which lie aback of all conventions.' But if the *right of worship* be secured to us by the constitution as a *civil right*, then the *majority-principle* has much to do with it. It has to *protect* it. It would at Rome put down the tyrant called the pope. It would in South America put down popery as the established religion. It *would not* erect another in its stead. It would *protect* it, while it did not burn heretics. It would close the inquisition. It would say to Jew,

Protestant, Papist, we protect you all, while you *mind your own business*. In England, and Scotland, and Ireland, it would break down the Episcopal and Presbyterian establishments; and expelling the word *toleration* from the earth, would put in its place *protection to all—equal rights to all*. So far, therefore, the majority-principle ‘does belong to this category,’ and so far do these *rights* which ‘lie aback of all conventions,’ enter directly into the question of *civil liberty*.”

Again, on pp. 64, 65, we find the following commentary by Mr. Breckinridge upon the definition of civil liberty which had been adopted.

“But we will meet the gentleman’s wish for a more specific examination of *civil liberty*. The definition adopted by us is this, viz.

“‘*The absolute rights of an individual restrained only for the preservation of order in society.*’

“‘*Absolute*’—not in respect to the Creator. As it respects him, all human rights are precarious and dependant. He may take away life, liberty, and happiness. ‘In him we live and move and have our being,’ is the language of a heathen, but adopted and commended by an inspired apostle. In respect therefore to God, the absolute rights of an individual can mean no more than his natural rights. But these rights may be called absolute in respect to the laws of men. They are absolute in essence so far as they are indefeasible. And they are absolute in fact so far as they are not divested by the just powers of government.

“‘*Restrained.*’ The Declaration of the American Independence will show us in what sense *restraint* is lawful.

“The second paragraph of that instrument reads thus:—‘We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the *consent* of the governed.’

“From this it appears, that the end of government is to secure to individuals the enjoyment of their inalienable rights, and that the foundation of all just government rests upon the *consent* of the governed; and therefore, if our definition is just, the restraint intended must be *self-imposed*, or such as rests upon *consent* freely given.

“‘*Order in society.*’ This phrase cannot be intended to apply to the *actual forms* of government, if the preceding



remarks are just; for if we should so understand it, civil liberty would be a variable quantity, ranging between the extremes of a pure democracy and an absolute despotism. In the United States it would be one thing—in England another—in France another—in Austria another—in Russia another—in Italy another—*alia Romae—alia Athenis*: yet this is the very ground that the gentleman has already taken. It would be any thing or nothing. Civil liberty, therefore, is not the *residuum* of freedom, after making such deductions or subtractions from the absolute or natural rights of man as are necessary to preserve the *particular* order established in the country where he happens to be, or to be born; but it is the residuum of freedom, after making *such deductions only* from his natural rights, as the social condition, *in its best form*, requires. These deductions are few, and consequently the *residuum* is large—such at least were the views of the signers of the Declaration of Independence; such cannot be the gentleman's. *They* declared that the object of the institution of government is to preserve the *inalienable* rights of individuals, comprising, in this class, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But we are not left to inferences—they declared in express terms, that when any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, *it is the right of the people to alter and abolish* it. If this sentiment be just, it puts an end to the doctrine of legitimacy and the divine right of kings; and it shows that civil liberty is much more than that miserable pittance of freedom, which the established order of society throughout the whole, or almost the whole of Europe, allows. It proves the right of *expatriation*, notwithstanding the claims and pretended rights of monarchs, to the persons of their subjects; it proves the right of *revolution*—the instrument itself is professedly a revolutionary paper, and *justifies that as a right, which legitimacy denominates rebellion and treason*; and we should like to know whether the gentleman thinks our revolution was rebellion, our resistance, treason? The instrument asserts that the people are the source of all just government—that the rightful continuance of it in any form depends upon their will—that they have the right 'to alter or abolish it, and institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.' It is evident therefore that by *order in society*, cannot be intended the *established order*, unless civil liberty

may consist with acts of despotism; for such acts are *consistent* with the order of society in despotic states; and they may be *necessary* to maintain the established order of society in such states. The tenants of the Bastille and of the Inquisition may have suffered according to *law*—the law of the state to which it was their misfortune to belong. Indulgence to the full measure of the natural rights of man, only *duly* restrained, might often result in a dethronement and a revolution."

The answer of Mr. Hughes, on p. 83, is as follows:—

"We now pass to the gentleman's long commentary on the definition of 'CIVIL LIBERTY.' By this we agreed to understand '*the absolute right of the individual restrained only for the preservation of order in society.*' This definition, his own, must be very obscure, when four pages have been wasted in commentaries on it, which, however, only wrap it up in thicker folds of obscurity. It is much easier to understand the *text* than the *commentary*. The whole seems to be intended as a high-wrought panegyric of the principles set forth in the constitution, of which I am as fond an admirer as the gentleman can be. Yet I must say, that this perpetual stooping to flatter the republican feelings of the audience, is but a lame way of maintaining an argument, whilst it is any thing but complimentary to their understandings."

Again, on p. 84, is the following passage:—

"Neither can I help believing that the gentleman has perverted the meaning and spirit of the American constitution, when he tells us that '*it justifies as a right that which legitimacy denominates rebellion and treason.*' This is injudicious praise. I presume the advocates of 'rebellion and treason' against this government, would find themselves mistaken in appealing to the constitution for their *right to perpetrate rebellion and treason*. The gentleman wishes to know whether I think '*our revolution was rebellion, our resistance, treason?*' I answer, that, *in my opinion*, our revolution was a successful experiment of popular resistance against unjust and tyrannical oppression, justified, not by the broad principles of anarchy laid down by him, but justified by the *particular grievances to which it owed its origin*. I believe it was so understood by the immortal men who wrought out the experiment and constructed the fabric of our national independence."

We have chosen to let our authors speak for themselves

upon the questions with which this series of extracts was introduced. We will now add a few remarks of our own.

The social edifices constructed by the American constitutions are altogether peculiar; and we are by no means sure that transatlantic systems of natural and political law, can be made to harmonize perfectly with our institutions. It appears to us that the natural proneness of the human mind to copy, has led us to adopt principles, theories, and parts of systems, which have respect to political adaptations at variance with the spirit of our institutions. There was a time when the Decree of Gratian was the great fountain, not only of ecclesiastical, but of civil jurisprudence. It was cited, not only in ecclesiastical and secular tribunals, but was invoked as authority in the explanation of treaties. It was almost, if not quite, the public law of Europe. This decree and the Decretals, and other canonical compilations which followed it, had for their object to reorganize society, by the introduction of new principles. The scheme was broken at the reformation, yet it has left many traces of its existence upon European institutions—many fragments *rari nantes in gurgite vasto*. We see them, but seldom think of tracing them to their source. The influence of this system upon Europe in former ages, and at the present day, has not been developed with that sagacity which its importance requires. It is enough for us to know, however, that the distribution of rights into distinct orders, and the definitions given of them in one of the foregoing extracts, are chiefly of canonical origin.

Under the head of divine right, we are taught that the apostles had the right to establish Christianity, and that their *legitimate successors* have the right to perpetuate it;—that these rights are peculiar to them *only* to whom God has given them—that it is the *duty* of men to *hear* (and practice) the doctrines of Christianity from *those* who have the right to preach them, &c.

Now we object to these views, not so much in the abstract, as to the form in which they are presented, and the intent to which they are applied. We object that Mr. Hughes has not only mistaken the *name* of the thing, but in his own words, he has mistaken the category to which it belongs. The gospel is a *ministry*, and those to whom it is committed are properly said to be in the exercise of duties, not of rights. Luke calls it *διακονίαν τοῦ λόγου*. The first teachers were called ambassadors, apostles. They acted not in the exercise of any



right which they possessed, comparable to the natural or political right, but merely by authority, and in the name of him who sent them. The word *hierarchy*, though quite canonical, was unknown in the early Christian church. The apostles and their immediate successors, preferred to be called the ministers (servants) of others, rather than their lords and princes. We grant, however, in reference to places, ranks, offices in the hierarchy, and emoluments annexed to them, the territorial jurisdictions of prelates, &c., the word *right* is appropriate. But that such rights are divine, we deny. The hierarchy is the work of man, and the rights which are incident to its ranks exist no where except by force of civil law. John Huss said, *Papalis dignitas a Caesare inolevit et papae præfectro et institutio a Caesaris potentia emanavit*; and it is true, notwithstanding the decree of the council of Constance. The title of archbishop was absolutely unknown in the primitive church. It was unknown even so late as the council of Nice. But not to dwell upon this point, the proposition that it is the *duty* of men to hear the doctrines of Christianity from the *priesthood* of the *Catholic church* (for so we understand the proposition), is certainly at variance with the theology of the American constitutions. For if God has invested that priesthood, exclusively of all others, with a *divine right* to teach, and correlatively with that right, has imposed on men the duty to hear them, and them only, then it is not true that men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, unless their consciences dictate the Roman Catholic worship. It is not true that men have the *right* to worship in *several different* ways, if it be their *duty* to worship in *one* particular way. Further, if this doctrine be true, then men can of right be compelled to attend, erect, and support places for Roman Catholic worship, because they cannot, without a violation of duty, withhold this service. If it be by right divine that the Roman Catholic clergy exercise their functions, and if Almighty God has made it the duty of men to hear them, how are the rights of men violated by compelling them to do their duty? What is a *duty*? If it be a moral obligation to do a thing, can we suppose the existence of a duty, an obligation imposed by Almighty God to do a thing, and at the same time of a natural and indefeasible right not to do it unless the individual thinks it right? "Rights and duties are correlative"—the one is fitted to the other. They are not contrarient. The reader will observe

we are not now upon the orthodoxy of the principle. We waive that question for the present. We are upon the congruity between the notion of the divine right in the Roman Catholic priesthood, and religious duties of mankind to hear them, on the one hand, and the American constitutions on the other. These instruments assume that there may be a diversity in the forms of worship—they suppose the existence of different and distinct ecclesiastical jurisdictions, and it is with tacit reference to these, they affirm that men have there natural and indefeasible rights. We know that every variety of worship which now exists, existed at the formation of these constitutions. Every one of them repudiates the Roman Catholic idea, that the visible church is one communion, having one visible head in the Roman pontiff. Nay, more, it was expressly to protect the members of the various visible communions in the enjoyment of their diversified forms and systems, that these clauses were introduced. We must suppose that those who framed and those who adopted this principle, thought it not contrary to the divine will. Did they deliberately intend to protect men in the violation of their duties, in withholding from others their rights? Did they mean to set up their will against the will of God—their protection against God's power? Yet Mr. Hughes' definition teaches us that the papal hierarchy has, by *divine right*, the *exclusive power* to teach and perpetuate the religion of Christ, and that it is the religious *duty* of men to hear *them*, and *no* other teachers. Upon this divine right the hierarchy is founded, with all its jurisdictions, offices and emoluments. If, then, we do but assume the existence of such a divine right and corresponding duty, the establishment of the Roman Catholic religion by law is justified; for a man's rights are violated when he is compelled to do that which he has a *right* to omit, not when he is compelled to render unto others the rights which God has given them, or to perform duties which God has given others a right to exact of them. It would be absurd to appeal to a *natural right* as an excuse for withholding a duty which is exacted by divine right. There can be no such conflict. If the natural right exists, it exists because God (the author of nature) has given it. It is as *divine* as any right can be. If the divine right of the priesthood exists, it is demonstrative that there is no natural right in others inconsistent with it, but this falsifies the assertion of the constitution, that all men have a natural and

indefeasible right to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences.

View the question as we may, the conflict between this theory of divine right, and the natural rights of conscience is inevitable. One must give way to the other. It has been proved in another article, that the *principle of the American constitution is Protestantism*,—that it is in essence irreconcilably hostile to the exclusive pretensions of the Roman see.

[To be continued.]

---

ART. V.—1. *The Greek Testament, with English notes, critical, philological, and exegetical, partly selected and arranged from the best commentators, ancient and modern, but chiefly original, &c. &c.* By the Rev. S. T. Bloomfield, D. D. F. S. A., Vicar of Bisbrooke, Rutland. First American, from the second London edition. In two Volumes. Boston: published by Perkins & Marvin. Philadelphia: Henry Perkins. 1837.

2. *The New Testament arranged in Historical and Chronological order, with copious notes on the principal subjects in Theology, &c. &c.* By Rev. George Townsend, M. A., Prebendary of Durham, &c. *The whole revised, divided into paragraphs, &c. &c.* By the Rev. T. W. Coit, D. D., President of Transylvania University. Boston: published by Perkins & Marvin. Philadelphia: Henry Perkins. 1837. 8vo. pp. 455 and 472.

DR. BLOOMFIELD has been long known to biblical students, as the author of a "Critical Digest of Sacred Annotations on the New Testament," in eight volumes, a work of great research and labour. He therefore came to the task of preparing a second edition of his Greek Testament with English notes, with the advantage of having gone repeatedly over the whole ground. Besides this, he is evidently a scholar, familiar with the Greek language and literature, and a man of untiring industry. In this, as in his larger work, he almost uniformly manifests a moderate and unassuming temper; giving himself much less credit than is common among commentators; carefully quoting his predecessors, where others would be content to borrow the substance of their statements,



without the formality of quotation. This habit, though evincing right feeling, our author carries to an excess, so as to give his books a mosaic character and appearance. It is easy to preserve a good conscience in this matter by abstaining from claiming what does not belong to us, and avoiding those forms of expression, which are adapted to make the reader infer that what we state is all the result of our own extensive research. There is a vast mass of exegetical matter which is, as it were, common property, being found more or less in all extended commentaries. This we may fairly use without special acknowledgement, provided we avoid setting up a special claim to it. These materials must pass through the writer's own mind, and be wrought into a consistent and uniform mass, and brought to sustain the particular views he may entertain of the sacred text. And it is easy for the intelligent reader to see when this is done, and when the writer is a mere transcriber. Our author certainly avoids all undue claims to originality, and rather injures the effect of his writings by the frequency of his literal quotations. It is very characteristic of his manner, as is particularly obvious in his prefaces, that instead of expressing the commonest sentiments in his own language, he says, as the learned Dr. A. or Bishop B., or some one else well observes.

The moderation of the writer is evinced not only in the modesty of his claims, but in the general spirit of his work. Though a consistent and decided Episcopalian, he rarely manifests any disposition to polemics. His peculiar opinions are introduced only in those passages where we might justly expect to find them, and are not obtruded with partisan zeal on all occasions. He believes in baptismal regeneration, in the apostolic origin of the prelatical office, and he rejects the doctrines of personal election and perseverance of the saints. But these points are never offensively introduced or discussed.

In addition to learning, moderation, modesty, and industry, Dr. Bloomfield deserves great credit for good judgment in adopting so simple and convenient a form for his present work. The Greek text is given at the top of the page, and the notes are printed in double columns at the bottom. The reader is thus enabled to take in the text and explanation at one view. Another great recommendation of the work is, that it is the only one of the kind. It has no competitor in the English language. This consideration, in addition to the beauty and correctness with which it is printed, will, we

presume, secure for it a wide circulation. Having mentioned the general characteristics of a favourable kind which distinguish the work before us, we must in justice present those of an opposite nature. The writer has not sufficient reliance on his own judgment, or has too much respect for the great names of his own church, and distinguished critics in general. Some of the most objectionable passages in the book are quotations from the dignitaries of the Episcopal church, whose sentiments are often introduced out of respect apparently for their learning or station, when the writer's own views, as far as we can judge, would have led to much better interpretations. The author also seems frequently to get bewildered amidst the multitude of expositions, so as not to know what he thinks himself. He therefore frequently gives inconsistent interpretations of the same passage, or contradicts in one place what he had said in another. He appears to have paid much more attention to classical literature and biblical criticism, than to theology; and his doctrinal views are evidently, on many points, crude and unsettled. We find the most correct and most erroneous statements of the same doctrine scattered through his work. This is particularly the case with regard to the doctrines of justification and election. Another fault is, that a due proportion is not observed between the different parts of the work. Difficult and important passages are often passed over very slightly, while comparatively unimportant ones are discussed at great length. There is almost as much said on the single word *νομιμὸς*, Heb. 9: 1, as on the whole of Rom. 5: 12—19. We know it must be very difficult to preserve, in a first attempt, a due proportion between the different portions of such an extended work. But this is in some sort an abridgment of a larger work, and also a second edition. We might therefore reasonably expect that more attention should be paid to this point. The great defect of the book, however, is that it is unsatisfactory. The reader in a multitude of cases having gone through the exposition, feels that he has learned nothing; that he knows no more of the meaning of the passage than he did before. This arises from various sources. The writer has little talent for condensation. He does not seem able to give a clear and concise statement of his opinions and the grounds of them; but is wordy, loose, and general. In many cases too, he makes little attempt at explanation, contenting himself with detached philological remarks. There is, therefore, a vagueness and

want of point characteristic of the whole production, which it is easier to state than to account for.

Having stated thus generally our opinion of this work, we must proceed to give our readers the means of judging for themselves. Dr. Bloomfield's book is both an edition of the text of the New Testament, and a perpetual commentary. It is therefore to be viewed under both of these aspects. The author informs us, with regard to the former of these points, that his object was to form a text so constructed that general readers of the New Testament might see the variations from the *textus receptus* distinctly marked in the text itself, and also to exhibit the state of the evidence, together with the reasons which had induced the editor to adopt any variations from the common text. "A new recension of the text formed on such a plan, however desirable, or even necessary, was not to be found in this country; nor, indeed, in any other, based on sound principles of criticism; the texts for academic and general use on the continent, being little more than reprints of that of Griesbach," p. vii. Again, on p. xi. he says, "The text has been formed (after long and repeated examinations of the whole of the New Testament for that purpose solely) on the basis of the last edition of Robert Stephens, adopted by Mill, whose text differs very slightly from, but is admitted to be preferable to, the common text, which originated in the Elzevir edition of 1624. From this there has been no deviation except on the most preponderating evidence; critical conjecture being wholly excluded, and such alterations only introduced as rest on the united authority of manuscripts, ancient versions, and fathers, and the early printed editions, but especially upon the invaluable *Editio Princeps* [meaning the Complutensian], and which had been already adopted in one or more of the critical editions of Bengel, Wetstein, Matthaei, and Scholz."

We have much doubt as to the wisdom of this whole plan, and much more as to the skill with which it has been executed. The multiplication of texts of the New Testament, all differing more or less from each other, is in itself an evil. To a certain extent it is a necessary evil. The results of the critical labours of editors devoted to this department of biblical study, should, when completely authenticated, be introduced into editions designed for general use. But we think it very undesirable that every commentator should become an editor, and set forth a new text. It would be much better to assume some corrected text, and if in any particular case,



he thought it needed further correcting, let him state his opinion, and the grounds of it, in his notes. The author indeed says, there does not exist a text, either in England or any other country, formed on the plan which he proposed, the texts for general use on the continent being little more than reprints of that of Griesbach. But this is a great mistake. The editions of Tittmann, Knapp, Lachmann, &c. are far from being mere reprints of that of Griesbach. They are all constructed on principles which their authors have carefully exhibited. And that of Knapp is so correct, so well pointed and arranged, and so convenient, that it has obtained almost universal currency both in Europe and in this country. That our author should overlook it, as he does in his preface, is to us a matter of surprise. The edition of Lachmann is in Germany, to some extent, obtaining precedency over Knapp's and all others. This edition, however, from the peculiar plan of its author, is not adapted for general use. He does not profess to give the text which he thinks, all evidence considered, is the best, but simply that which prevailed in the eastern churches within the few first centuries.

Though the formation of a new text, for general use, we think at present uncalled for, yet had the plan been well executed, there would be less reason for regret. We fear this, however, is not the case. We do not object so much to the readings which the author has adopted, as to the mode of proceeding, to the absence of any such statement of his critical principles, or of the evidence in favour of the reading which he adopts, as to give the intelligent reader any satisfaction as to the soundness of his judgment, or the correctness of his decisions. He tells us, indeed, that critical conjecture is discarded, that he departs from the text of Robert Stephens only on the authority of manuscripts, versions, fathers, and early printed editions. But we do not know how he estimates the testimony of the manuscripts, whether by number, antiquity, or families. We are ignorant what weight he assigns to the versions either collectively or singly. He avows "his dissent, though not from the canons of criticism professedly acted upon by Griesbach in his edition of the New Testament, yet altogether from the *system of recensions* first promulgated by him." Yet we find him referring to the Western, Alexandrian and Byzantine recensions, which is precisely Griesbach's classification. In what sense does he use these terms, or what classification does he adopt?

Is it that of Nolan, some of whose terms and characteristic critical opinions we see at times in the annotations? We have not been able to discover, and of course cannot tell what weight is due to his statements that this or that reading is supported "by different recensions." Yet this is the main point. If Griesbach's classification is right, his text is right; if his classification is wrong, as is now almost universally admitted, then his text, so far as it is peculiar, has no authority. As Griesbach has unfolded his plan, the reader can judge of the authority of his readings; but as Dr. Bloomfield has not exhibited his system, we can have no intelligent opinion as to the credit due to his text.\* A few examples will be sufficient to illustrate the nature and force of our objection. In Matt. 8: 28, the author says, "the manuscripts fluctuate between Γεργασηνῶν, Γαδασηνῶν, and Γερασηνῶν. The weight of authority, as far as regards number of manuscripts, is in favour of the first mentioned, which is the common reading; but those manuscripts are chiefly of an inferior kind, and of one class; while Γαδασηνῶν is supported by a not inconsiderable number of manuscripts of great antiquity and different recensions, by the Peschito, Syriac and Persic versions, and some Fathers, as Eusebius, Epiphanius and Chrysostom. As to Γερασηνῶν it is supported almost solely by the Vulgate and a few inferior versions. Now if *external* evidence was alone to be considered we must prefer Γεργασηνῶν. But *internal* evidence must be taken into account, and that, as we shall see, is strongly in favour of Γαδασηνῶν." This might do well enough for a commentator, but the statements are altogether too general and loose for an editor. No reader, who understands the subject, could learn the state of the external evidence in relation to the text from the above account. The majority of the manuscripts, he tells us, are in favour of the first reading, but their testimony is set aside because they are of an inferior kind, and of one class. But he neither tells us of what kind nor of what class. The fact is that they are modern manuscripts, and of the Byzantine class: the very class of which the writer says, in his preface, that it

\* We hope we do not unintentionally do the author injustice in these remarks. We find no exhibition of his critical principles on this and other important points either in the preface, or in his annotations, under some of the most important disputed passages. If such exhibition is hidden in some part of his notes, it is more his fault than ours that we have not found it out. These are preliminary matters which must be stated at once, or no judgment can be formed of the correctness of his decisions in any one case.

presents a purer text than the more ancient manuscripts of the Western and Alexandrian recensions.\* The second reading is said to be supported by no inconsiderable number of manuscripts of great antiquity, and of different recensions, by several of the fathers, and the best versions. This being the case, as the author had objected to the manuscripts in favour of the first reading, because they were modern and all of one class, we should expect him to decide that the external evidence was in favour of this second reading. He however makes the opposite decision, and rests his preference of the second reading on internal evidence, and says that the external evidence is in favour of the first, thus making mere number counterbalance antiquity, diversity of class, and the authority of the versions. We very frequently meet with the expression "the best manuscripts," for example, Luke 8: 43. 9: 1. &c. &c.; but we do not know what manuscripts in our author's estimation are the best. Most critics consider the ancient uncial manuscripts as entitled to most authority; but Dr. Bloomfield, as we have seen, says he prefers some modern manuscripts of the Byzantine class. Yet in the cases referred to, as supported by the best manuscripts, it is the ancient uncial manuscripts whose support is relied upon. Again, in a great number of cases, as in Acts 18: 5, we have such general expressions as "some manuscripts, several versions, and a few fathers." Such statements give an editor no authority in the judgment of his readers. We wish to know how many and what manuscripts or versions are for or against a particular passage. In the case referred to, it turns out that the some manuscripts are A, B, D, E, 13, 40, 73, 137, 142; the several versions are both the Syriac versions, the Arabic, Coptic, Sahidic, Ethiopic, and the Vulgate; and the fathers, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Jerome, who all read *λόγω* instead of *πνεύματι*. This must be admitted to be very weighty evidence: and accordingly Bengel, Pearce, Kuinoel, Griesbach, Knapp, Tittmann, Scholz, prefer *λόγω*. Yet our author, on the loose statement just quoted, says "the external authority for that reading is slender, and the internal by no means strong."

The far more important passage, Acts 20: 28, he discusses

\* "He (i. e. the author) is still firmly persuaded that the most ancient manuscripts of the Western and Alexandrian family do not present so pure a text as that of some comparatively modern ones of the Constantinopolitan family. . . . In short, he has no doubt that the texts of the first mentioned manuscripts were systematically altered, for various reasons, by the early biblical critics," p. xxiv.



at much greater length, but we cannot think in a very critical or satisfactory manner. We have no space to enter on the examination of so difficult a question as the true reading in this passage. We shall simply remark on our author's view of the manuscript authority in relation to the case. "Κυρίου is supported," he says, "by thirteen manuscripts, five of them very ancient, and the rest neither ancient nor valuable." [Scholz, however, quotes eighteen, and among them A, C, D, E.] The second reading, "τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ is supported by *one* very ancient manuscript, and sixty-three others, none of much antiquity or consequence, but of different families. . . . τοῦ θεοῦ is supported by the most ancient of the manuscripts (the Cod. Vat.) and seventeen others, some of them of the 10th, 11th, and 12th centuries, but most of them more modern." From this statement of the case, our author infers, "It is manifest τοῦ κυρίου is greatly inferior in manuscript authority to τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ, and not superior to τοῦ θεοῦ," that is, five very ancient manuscripts, and eight modern ones, are much inferior to *one* ancient one and sixty-three others of not much antiquity or consequence, but of different families; and not superior to *one* ancient and seventeen others. We think this is an inference to which few critics would assent. On the contrary, if manuscript authority alone was to be taken into account, we should reverse the statement. Our author decides, in view of all the evidence, in favour of τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ, and remarks that "as τοῦ κυρίου was evidently formed on τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ, that is decisive." The force of this remark we cannot perceive. We are inclined to think, in view of the evidence of the versions and fathers, which the reader may find exhibited in Wetstein or Scholz, that the readings should be arranged in regard to their respective claims, τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου, and last of all τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ.

On Rom. 8: 10, our author tells us, "The edd. princ. the *textus receptus*, and several manuscripts and fathers have τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος κτλ. which is adopted by Vater. The other reading, τὸ ἐνοικούν κτλ. however, is, with reason, preferred by Griesbach, Knapp, Matthaei, Tittmann, as being the more difficult." Such statements give very little information to the reader as to the real state of the evidence. We know not which manuscripts support the one reading, or which support the other. It is useless to multiply examples. This is our author's method. He scarcely ever so presents the evidence that the reader can judge of the correctness of his decisions. It would require no more space to exhibit the evidence properly, than

the author, in most cases, occupies by his general statements. It would have taken up little room to say that the common text, in Rom. 8: 10, is supported by A, B, among the uncial manuscripts, and eight of the *minuscrit*. and the other reading by D, E, F, G, I, of the one class, and 23, as quoted by Scholz, of the other class. Though our author exhibits a very commendable degree of diligence, yet he has not gone the right way to work. He has formed no correct idea of what is expected of an editor of the sacred text. Neither in his preface nor his notes, does he so state his principles, or so exhibit the grounds of his decision, that the reader can judge of the propriety of the reading which he has adopted. His text therefore cannot be received with confidence. And we must repeat what we said at first, that it would have been much better had he adopted some text, such as that of Knapp, for example, and given it without alteration; and in his notes indicated the few corrections he thought desirable.

It is time however to attend to the exegetical department of the work before us. In our introductory remarks we have already adverted to the general features of the work. We must now refer to specific cases in illustration of the author's manner as an interpreter, and his opinions as a theologian. There is a great difference between the first and second volumes. The former, being devoted to the historical books, is, as might be expected, less full and less minute. The great fault of the first volume is, that the annotations are too much in the form of detached scholia; the discourses as discourses, or narratives as narratives, are not unfolded or explained. Let the reader turn to the exposition of the sermon on the mount, and he will feel the import and justice of our criticism. That important portion of scripture is entered upon without a preliminary remark, and is, for the most part, dispatched with brief grammatical or explanatory observations on particular forms of expression. To the Gospel of John our author devotes more attention. The discourse of our Saviour with Nicodemus is preceded by two long columns of introductory matter, which however consists almost entirely in conjectures as to the character and object of the Jewish ruler. In the exposition of this all-important exhibition of a fundamental truth of the gospel we find very little to commend. We are in a few words told that the expression *γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν* was a common one among the Jews to signify "*an entire change of heart and life*, though it was almost always connected with baptism as the symbol and pledge of it." But we do not find one word on the ground of the ne-

cessity of this new birth, no explanation of the expressions *to enter into the kingdom of God; to be born of the flesh; is flesh; to be born of the spirit; is spirit*; all these are passed over. And on the phrase γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος we are only told that ὕδατος must be understood of baptism is quite plain from Titus 3: 5. Considering the space which our author gives to very subordinate matters, this is a very unsatisfactory degree of brevity. It appears from the little that is said that the writer is a believer in baptismal regeneration. This is not an inference to be drawn from his explaining ὕδατος in v. 5, of baptism, for many, who have no faith in that doctrine, understand our Saviour as there teaching that baptism (i. e. the open profession of his religion by the reception of baptism) and a spiritual new birth are both necessary for admission into the kingdom of heaven. But the reference to Titus 3: 5, and the author's remarks on that passage, make his views clear on this point. On the phrase διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας (Titus 3: 5), he remarks, "The ancient expositors almost universally, (see Chryst. 1. 323,) and all the most eminent modern commentators are agreed that by παλιγγ. is meant *baptismal regeneration*. . . . The term indeed might, without the adjunct λουτρον, mean *moral regeneration*." Had he stopped here we should have inferred that baptismal regeneration was not *moral* regeneration; but he immediately adds, that the following clause of the verse, *by the renewing of the Holy Ghost*, "must, of course, be primarily understood of the renovation proceeding from the regenerating grace of baptism; though it must not be confined to that; but understood of that moral renovation begun in baptism, but requiring the aid of the Holy Spirit through the whole of life." The reader will perceive that this is not an interpretation of the apostle's language, but a statement of the writer's own ideas on the subject. The words λουτρον παλιγγενεσίας mean *a washing which is regeneration*, or, *which is the cause of it*, and they can scarcely mean any thing else. All we have to do is to learn what παλιγγενεσία means. If we are to take our author's word for it, it very rarely means a *moral regeneration*. If so, the passage, even supposing λουτρον to mean *baptism*, teaches nothing about "the regenerating grace of baptism," but merely that we are saved by a washing (baptism), which is not a *moral* new birth, but the means of translation from one state to another. According to all the best means of judging, however, the word in question does in scriptural language mean *moral* regeneration.



As it only occurs elsewhere in the doubtful passage Matt. 19: 28, we must decide its meaning from its etymology, and from the use of cognate and analogous terms. Παλιγγενεσία, then, according to its etymology, is equivalent to τὸ ἐκ δευτέρου γεννηθῆναι and that again to τὸ ἀνωθεν γεννηθῆναι, which of course would lead us to the idea of a moral change. And then again, the cognate or analogous terms γεννάω, ἀναγεννάω, ἀνακαινόω, ἀνακαινώσις, καινὴ κτίσις, when employed in relation to religious subjects, are always used in reference to a moral change. The word in question, therefore, there can be little doubt, means *regeneration* in the modern and general sense of that term, i. e. a new birth, or change of heart. If this be so, the passage in Titus teaches that we are saved by a washing which is a regeneration, a great moral change; and if λουτρὸν means baptism, then baptism is this moral regeneration, or the cause of it. But who has proved that λουτρὸν does mean baptism? The word itself has not this meaning; the context does not require this interpretation, nor do parallel and analogous passages favour it. On the contrary, it seems very plain that the apostle designed by the very form of expression to guard against such a misconception. He defines the *washing* of which he speaks as a παλιγγενεσία, a great moral change, and explains it by the following clause, "the renewing of the Holy Ghost." In the note on 1 Cor. 6: 11, our author's views on this subject are still more strongly expressed. On the expression "but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified," &c., he remarks; "In the first of these terms, there is an allusion to baptism; in the second and third, to its effects and benefits, sanctification and justification." He sustains his interpretation by citing from bishop Bull, the following passage, "*Lavatio* significat primam a vitiis per baptismum purgationem; *sanctificatio* praeparationem et quasi formationem hominis per gratiam Spiritus Divini, ad opera bona facienda, vitamque sanctam degendam; *justificatio* denique amorem illum Dei, quo jam sanctam vitam degentes complexitur, eosque in Christo vitae aeternae praemio dignos censet." This is an illustration of the degree to which the leaven of papal theology has found its way into the church of England. Not so much indeed into its articles or liturgy, as into the minds of its dignitaries and theologians. This, as it seems to us, is easily accounted for. The church of England, as far as regards its peculiarities, rests in common with the Romish church, on tradition and the testimony of the fathers,

and not on the scriptures. In defending these peculiarities, therefore, recourse is had to these fathers; they are regarded as great authorities, not merely as to matters of form and government, but as to doctrine; and hence it is that the loose and antisciptural views which soon corrupted the purity of the gospel are constantly reappearing in the writings of the earlier, and even, as we see, the more modern theologians of the church of England. Hence we are told, even in this recent work, that "sanctification and justification are the effects of baptism," and in the language of bishop Bull, that justification is that love of God by which he embraces those who live a holy life.

The note on John 6: 37, *all that the Father giveth me, shall come to me*, is also characteristic of our author's manner of dealing with controverted doctrinal matters. As to the sense in which the Father is said to *give* men to Christ, he says, "expositors differ in opinion. The Calvinistic ones, as may be imagined, understand it of being chosen of the Father to eternal salvation by an absolute decree. But to this view see the unanswerable objections of Grotius, Hammond, and Whitby, as also of Chrysostom, who ascribes the dogma to the Manicheans. The term, therefore, (here and at v. 39 and 65) must signify something compatible with the free agency of man. . . . To *give* men to Christ, is evidently equivalent to *draw* them to Christ: and how irreconcilable that is with the compulsion implied in the Calvinistic interpretation of giving, is obvious." The word ἐλκύειν he tells us, "denotes a power not compulsory, but strongly suasive, meaning to *draw* (not *drag*) any one; i. e. to sway the understanding, or incline the will by all moral means and fit motives as propounded in the revelation of his will in the holy scriptures." This, however, is not all that is meant; the terms used, he says, "undoubtedly point to a most important doctrine—that of the preventing grace of God by his Holy Spirit, indispensably necessary to any one's being given to Christ by God; and also for the co-operating grace of that Spirit after we have been brought to Christ by his preventing grace—proving the truth of what is said in our article, that 'We have no power to do works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.'" This is very tolerable Calvinism, very much better than the most of that which is taught by some professed Calvinists of the present day.

The note on Acts 13: 48, is very long; more space is devoted to the single clause *καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅσοι ᾗσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, than to the whole paragraph in Rom. 5: 12—19. Our author of course objects to the ordinary interpretation, and yet neither approves of connecting *εἰς ζωὴν αἰ.* with *ἐπιστ.*, nor is disposed to take *τεταγμένοι*, in a middle sense, “those who had arrayed themselves for salvation.”\* He adopts another sense of *τάσσεσθαι εἰς*, viz. *to be thoroughly disposed for*, or *purposed for*, *bent on*, and states the full meaning to be, “whose minds were in a fit state to judge of the evidence of the truth of the gospel, who were seriously concerned about their salvation, and were thoroughly disposed to make all sacrifices to obtain eternal life.” Our author, after all his labour to disprove the Calvinistic interpretation of this passage, and to establish his own, virtually gives up every thing, by adding, “At the same time, while we contend that the doctrine of predestination can by no means be found here, yet it is proper to bear in mind that the *dispositions* of the persons in question could not have been what they were, or have been originally such, from themselves; but must be ascribed to the preventing grace of God, to which it is owing that men are ever disposed to embrace or obey the gospel of Christ.” With regard to the meaning of the passage itself little need be said. Admitting that *τεταγμένοι* may mean *disposed*, *bent upon*, we have the choice between the simple and ordinary meaning of the word as given by our translators *ordained*, and a very far fetched interpretation. Which is in most accordance with the analogy of the scriptures? Are men said to be called or chosen according to the purpose of God, or because they are in a state of mind to judge of the evidence of the gospel, &c. &c. The passage, though a very plain one, is not necessary for the support of the Calvinistic doctrine, though commentators of all classes admit our right to it.† Some

\* WINER, (Gram. p. 239), after giving several instances in which the perfect and pluperfect passive have the force of the middle, adds in a note, that MARKLAND reckons this passage as another example, and translates it thus, *et fidem professi sunt (quotquot tempus, diem), constituerant in vitam aeternam*. “This explanation,” rather discourteously adds Winer, “is likely to find, with impartial interpreters, about as little favour as most others which proceed from English philologists.”

† WAHL, in his *Clavis*, thus paraphrases the clause, *quos voluit Deus esse inter eos, quibus contingeret vita et felicitas aeterna*. OLSHAUSEN *Com. über das N. T.* “The idea of a *predestinatio sanctorum*, which pervades the whole scriptures, must be acknowledged in these words; and the attempts to obliterate it are to the last degree unnatural.”



of our author's objections to the common interpretation will excite surprise. "It is forbidden," he says, "by the word ἐπίστυσαν, which, under the present circumstances, can mean no more than that they believed in the Lord Jesus, and received the religion which he came to promulgate. Yet it cannot be supposed that *all* who did so were predestined to eternal life. There were doubtless, (as Schoettgen observes), among those believers, many hypocrites and evil livers, who eagerly enough embraced the theoretical truth, but cared not for the practice. These, then, were not predestined." *Valde quantum.*

With regard to Episcopacy, our author is moderate and modest. He says but little on the subject. In the index, under the word *bishop*, we are referred to the notes on Acts 15: 36. 20: 17. Phil. 1: 1. 1 Thess. 5: 12—14. and 1 Tim. 3: 1. These notes, however, are generally very brief. On Phil. 1: 1, he refers us to "the elaborate note of Whitby, who (inter alia) observes: 'The Greek and Latin fathers, with one consent, declare that the apostle here calls their presbyters their bishops.' . . . Notwithstanding what has been so confidently asserted, that there was no distinction between presbyters and bishops until some time after the apostolic age; the profoundly learned Bingham, in his *Eccles. Antiq.* L. II. 1., seems to have satisfactorily proved the existence of a power in the apostolic age equivalent to that of bishops; and in the next age to the apostolical, both the exercise of the power, and the assumption of the title of bishop." Again, in 1 Tim. 3: 1, he says, "I have fully shown, in the notes on Acts 11: 30. 20: 17. Phil. 1: 1, that originally the terms ἐπισκ. and πρεσβ. denoted the same offices in the church: and I pointed out also how the office of bishop (as we now use the term) was introduced." The note on Acts 20: 17 we believe is specially referred to. The author there remarks on the word πρεσβυτέρους, "As these persons are at v. 28 called ἐπισκόπους, and especially from a comparison of other passages (as 1 Tim. 3: 1), the best commentators have with reason inferred the terms as yet denoted the same thing. . . . Now all πρεσβύτεροι were officially ἐπίσκοποι. Yet we are not therefore to infer that there was no superintending supreme authority in the primitive church; for reason will show that no society can exist without some laws, and consequently persons to administer those laws. There can, then, be no doubt (?) but that one of the presbyters (as there were many at Ephesus) was in such a case, invested with authority over the others, and

consequently was a *bishop* in the modern sense of the term." Such reasoning cannot need refutation.

We proceed to select a few specimens of our author's comments on the Epistles. Rom. 1: 4, as might be expected of a faithful son of the church of England, which has always laid great stress on all the doctrines relating to the person of Christ, he interprets in the usual way, viz. as to his human nature indeed the son of David, but declared by the divine power to be the Son of God, as to his divine nature, by the resurrection from the dead. In v. 17, δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ κτλ. is rendered, "For the justification which is of God, is therein revealed to be by faith." And the author remarks that "faith here designates the *modus in quo* or the instrument by which, not the *causa causans seu efficiens*, i. e. not either the meritorious or efficient cause or ground of forgiveness." On the construction of the passage ἡλλαξαν τ. δόξαν τ. θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι κτλ. no remark is made. The sense is stated to be, "They dishonoured the glorious nature of the incorruptible God, by representing him under the likeness of," &c. This is inaccurate, the meaning is, "They exchanged the incorruptible God for the likeness," &c. The same mistake is made in v. 25, in regard to the expression μετήλλαξαν τ. ἀλήθειαν τ. θ. ἐν τῷ ψεύδει, which is made to mean, who change the true God into a lie, i. e. a pretended God, an idol. And ἐν τῷ ψεύδει is said to be for εἰς τὸ ψεύδος, a mode of interpretation which we are surprised to find in such a work.

In the beginning of ch. III. we find the following correct remark. After answering certain objections, the writer says, the apostle "draws the conclusion, that the law is insufficient to justify a man before God; and that for that justification, he will need righteousness of God through faith; which will, however, by no means tend to dispense with, but rather to confirm the obligations of the moral law." We make with design such citations as may serve to exhibit the writer's opinions on the leading doctrines of the gospel. On v. 20, where it is said, 'because, by the works of the law no flesh shall be justified,' &c. he argues to prove that νόμος here must mean the moral law, whether written or unwritten, i. e. law in general. Verse 21 is explained thus, "But *now* (i. e. under the present dispensation, the gospel) a method of justification appointed by God [rather a different explanation of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ from that which the introductory remark just

would lead us to expect], without reference to obedience to law of any kind, is revealed and promulgated; a method (which is no novelty) whose existence is attested by the law and the prophets." To the word ἀπολύτρωσις, he says, "Most commentators assign the sense *deliverance*, without any reference to ransom paid. There is, however, an *allusion* thereto, and *no more*(?). It here denotes the method of redemption provided by Christ." This is not very exact. In the first place it is not correct that most commentators assign to the word here the mere idea of *deliverance*. On the contrary, the great body even of the neological class of interpreters, give it its true sense, *deliverance by ransom*; see Wahl and Koppe as examples. In the second place, there is much more than a mere *allusion* to the idea of a ransom in the word. And, thirdly, it does not denote the *method* of redemption, but the redemption itself. The word ἱλαστήριον, in verse 25, he understands to mean an expiatory victim, a propitiatory sacrifice; and on v. 26 he quotes with approbation from Bengel the sentence, Summum hic paradoxon evangelicum; nam in lege conspicitur Deus justus et condemnans, in evangelio justus ipse, et justificans peccatores. And on v. 28 he cites, with commendation, Prof. Stuart, who says that passage means "We count it as certain that men are justified in a gratuitous manner through faith in Christ, and not by perfect obedience to the law."

As the concluding verses of this chapter, vs. 21—31, constitute one of the most important portions of the New Testament, we think the reader will consider our author's exposition of them disproportionately short. He devotes very nearly as much space to a single verse in Galatians, ch. 2: 20, as he does to the whole of this interesting passage. Brevity however is not the only fault. The passage is not unfolded, nor the relation of its several parts explained; and there is a vagueness in the exposition which leaves the mind unsatisfied.

With regard to chap. IV. our author remarks, "Here commences Part II. of the Epistle (extending from hence to the end of chap. VIII.), in which it is proved, that the gospel doctrine of justification by faith, or gratuitous justification, does not make void any law, whether natural or revealed, but is quite consistent with both." We think this a very erroneous view of the design of this and the following chapters, and, moreover, inconsistent with what the writer himself says immediately afterwards, for he tells us that the apos-



tle proves in this chapter, "1. That Abraham himself was justified by faith, and not by circumcision (4: 1—12): that therefore justification is by faith, i. e. gratuitous, and not by works of law; and belongs to the uncircumcised Gentiles, no less than to the Jews. 2. That the believing Gentiles are part of the true seed of Abraham, intended in the promise, (4: 13—18,) and that therefore the Gentiles, by faith in Jesus Christ, have equal claim with the Jews to justification and all the benefits of the covenant." If this is correct, the design of the chapter is to establish the doctrine of justification by faith, and not to prove that it does not make void the law.

The full sense, he tells us, of the clause *Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness*, is, "Abraham placed entire confidence in God and his promises, with respect to offspring, &c., performing all such things as, by the light of nature, reason, and conscience, he supposed would be acceptable to God, though unenlightened by that future revelation of his will which he anxiously anticipated. Therefore God reckoned his pious reliance and devotedness to him for, and took them *instead* of, all those more perfect observances of faith and practice which a future revelation of his will should promulgate and enjoin. So Prof. Stuart, after remarking that the phrase ἐλογίσθη εἰς δικ. being, at v. 4, interchanged with λογίζεται κατὰ χάριν, affords a satisfactory view of its meaning, thinks it must be, that in consequence of Abraham's belief, he was justified or accepted as righteous; i. e. he was gratuitously justified." Whether the author means by this to cite Prof. Stuart in support of his own interpretation of this passage, we do not exactly understand, and with how much justice such citation might be made, we do not pretend to know. The author quotes also from Mac-knight the following passage, which has at least the merit of being perfectly intelligible, "In judging Abraham, God will place on one side of the account his *duties*, and on the other his *performances*. And on the side of his performances he will place his faith, and by mere favour will value it as equal to a complete performance of his duties, and reward him as if he were a righteous person. But neither here nor in Gal. 3: 6, is Christ's righteousness said to be imputed to Abraham. Farther, as it is no where said in scripture that Christ's righteousness was imputed to Abraham, so neither is it said any where that Christ's righteousness is imputed to believers. In short, the uniform doctrine of scripture is, that the believer's faith is counted to him for righteousness by the mere

grace or favour of God through Jesus Christ, that is, on account of what Christ has done to procure that favour for him. This is all. Nor does the scripture carry the matter farther." Were this all that was said on this subject, our author's views on the subject of justification would be clear. It is not our business to discuss their soundness; we should like to know, however, how they are to be reconciled with some of his previous statements on the subject. On ch. 1: 17, he tells us faith is the *modus in quo*, the instrument by which we are justified: but here we are taught that faith holds a very different relation to justification. It is not the instrument, it is the ground, it is that which is taken *instead* of perfect obedience. It bears the same relation to our acceptance that obedience would do; it is only less in quantity. He had told us also, on ch. 3, that Christ saves us as an expiatory victim. If this be so, it is the merit of that victim, not our acceptance of him, or reliance upon him, which is the ground of acceptance. This placing the ground of our justification in any thing done by us or wrought in us, is a very serious error.

The important and difficult passage ch. 5: 12—19, is past over in a very cursory and unsatisfactory manner. The author professes to agree with Prof. Stuart, and refers to him with great commendation. "So far," he says, "the general scope is plain; but, as Stuart observes, the detail is replete with difficulties, which have, however, been, for the most part, successfully encountered by the learned Professor in his very valuable commentary, which I strongly recommend to all those of my readers who are desirous of understanding the course of reasoning in this important portion of scripture; and must content myself with referring them to his excellent analysis of the contents of these verses." We were surprised after this, to find him differing from Prof. Stuart in points which render it impossible that he should entertain the same opinion with the professor, as to the scope and reasoning of the apostle. He agrees, indeed, with him and most other commentators, in supposing that v. 12 contains the first member of a comparison which is completed in v. 18. He agrees also with him and others, in considering vs. 13, 14 as the proof of the proposition contained in v. 12. It is evident from this, that if he differs from Prof. Stuart as to the meaning of v. 12, he must differ from him in his view of the whole passage. And that he does thus differ, there can be no doubt. On the words ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἠμαρτον, after remarking on the different explanations given of ἐφ' ᾧ, he says, "The difficulty is

not such as needs to be removed in so violent a manner; for ἡμαρτον *sinned*, merely implies that they are 'treated as sinners,' 'considered guilty in the sight of God;' i. e. on account of Adam's fall. Thus the expression will be equivalent to ἀμαρτωλοὶ κατεσπάθησαν at v. 19." But Prof. Stuart tells us that πάντες ἡμαρτον mean *all have sinned in their own persons, or actually*. This is a radical difference. According to Bloomfield, the comparison is, 'as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed on all, because that all are considered guilty in the sight of God on account of the fall of that one man, so all are considered righteous in the sight of God, on account of the obedience of one man.' But according to Stuart, the comparison is, 'As all men have been introduced to sin and death by Adam' (i. e. as he explains him p. 216, 'as sin and death had been introduced into the world by one man, and become universal), so righteousness and life are provided for all by Christ,' p. 235. According to Bloomfield, the proposition contained in v. 12, which verses 13, 14 are intended to establish is, that all men are considered guilty in the sight of God on account of Adam's fall. According to Prof. Stuart, those verses are designed to prove that all men have sinned in their own persons. It is very obvious that these are radically different views of the whole passage. We think Bloomfield right in this case, and Prof. Stuart wrong. But the marvel is, that the former should think that he agrees with the latter. The wonder is increased when we look at the following verses. Bloomfield says the argument of vs. 13, 14 is well stated by Mr. Holden, thus, "Adam was subjected to death because he violated the law respecting the forbidden fruit; but from his time till that of Moses men were subject to death who had not violated any similar positive and express law; therefore, they must have been subjected to death and treated as sinners, not for their own actual sin, but in consequence of Adam's sin." This is an interpretation which Prof. Stuart rejects with great earnestness (see pp. 218, 19), and maintains that these verses prove that all men are sinners, in their own persons, and therefore death prevailed over them all. Yet in the sentence immediately preceding the one just quoted, Bloomfield says, "The common interpretation of the whole passage (vs. 13, 14), is confirmed by the Greek fathers and commentators. See the details in Stuart." Again, on the clause τοὺς μὴ ἡμαρτήσαντας καὶ κτλ. *who had not sinned*, &c., the writer remarks, "By the persons here adverted to are



meant, as bishop Warburton remarks, those who died before they came to the knowledge of good and evil, namely, infants and idiots." This interpretation, says Prof. Stuart, is generally rejected by distinguished critics of all parties, at the present day." It is very obvious that the author's ideas must be very confused, who can give such interpretations of the details of a passage, and yet imagine himself to agree with a writer as to its design and argument, who adopts views directly the reverse of his own on such essential points.

We remarked above that we thought the writer correctly explains the meaning of the words πάντες ἡμαρτον in saying that they imply, that all men are treated as sinners, or are considered guilty in the sight of God on account of Adam's fall. This no doubt is the *sense* of the passage, though not perhaps the *signification* of the words. That is, it may be doubted whether ἁμαρτάνω has the signification there assigned to it of *peccati culpam sustineo*, as Wahl expresses it, and yet this may be, and we doubt not is, the meaning intended to be expressed by the apostle by the whole context. This idea, however, may be expressed, though the word be translated according to its ordinary signification, provided we adhere to the strict force of the tense which the sacred writer uses. The aorist ἡμαρτον does not mean *have sinned*, but *sinned*. That is, it simply relates to the past, without any reference to any other portion of time; it also expresses that which is momentary in time past, in opposition to what is continuous or frequently repeated.\* Our translation, therefore, of πάντες ἡμαρτον, *all have sinned*, by bringing the action expressed by the verb into relation to the present time, naturally suggests the idea that 'all have sinned and are now sinners,' and on this account death has passed on all. The language of the apostle, however, correctly expresses the very idea demanded by the context, the scope of the passage, and the parallel expressions which occur in the following verses, 'As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, so death passed on all, for all sinned,' i. e. they all once sinned through that one man. The sense in which they sinned through him is explained by what follows; they were constituted sinners on account of his transgression, i. e. they are considered guilty in the sight of God on account of Adam's fall; as they are constituted righteous on account of Christ's righteousness.

\* See WINER's Gram. p. 251, 252. Robinson's Buttmann, p. 378.

The seventh chapter, as might be anticipated, is understood by our author as describing the exercises of an unrenewed man. On v. 14 he remarks, "Augustin, and most of the early modern commentators (especially of the Calvinistic school), maintain that the apostle here speaks of himself, and of regenerate Christians. But the ancient commentators and the later modern ones are of opinion that he speaks of the unregenerate, and consequently *per μετασχηματισμόν*, as before." With the latter our author professes to agree. On v. 17 he has the following passage (quoted from Young), "From both the foregoing instances the apostle draws the same conclusion—that the man thus acting in opposition to his conscience and best resolutions and endeavours, can hardly be considered a free agent; but must labour under some fatal bias, some inbred, indwelling principle of sin." We do not think that writers who are not of the Calvinistic school mend matters much. It is immediately added, "The apostle here, for the purpose of his argument, considers man as having two distinct natures, the *spiritual* and *carnal*. The former he now speaks of as the *real self*, which he calls at v. 17, &c. *I*; at v. 22, *inward man*; v. 23, *the law of the mind*; and describes 8: 1, by *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, &c." This looks like going back to the other interpretation; unless the writer departs so entirely from scriptural usage as to call mere natural conscience *spiritual*, or describe it as *κατὰ πνεῦμα*. That the writer does lose himself and fail to carry out his own hypothesis, we think very plain from his comment on v. 2 of the next chapter. "The νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος and the νόμος τῆς ἀμαρτίας," he tells us, "have reference to the *two principles of action* mentioned in the preceding chapter, by which the carnally minded and the spiritually minded are respectively led. The former is so called, as being implanted by the Spirit, the giver of life." Then, of course, the conflict detailed in the preceding chapter is not a conflict between natural conscience and corrupt inclination, but between a principle of action implanted by the Spirit of God and our corrupt nature, or as our author calls it, on v. 17, *the old man*. We ought perhaps to have quoted from the note on 6: 6 the writer's explanation of the phrase ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος, which, he says, "denotes the corrupt disposition, and even nature, which men derive from Adam, and which belongs to them in their unrenewed state. . . . To this is opposed the *new man*, the *holy disposition* and character infused by the Holy Spirit and required by the gospel."

The phrase φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός, in v. 6, is inadequately explained as "the being devoted to the flesh by the medium of the animal propensities."\* The word δύναιται, v. 7, he tells us, "The most enlightened commentators, ancient and modern, are agreed must be taken in a popular sense, as in the next verse, so as not to exclude the liberty of human action, or interfere with man's free will. See Bp. Bull's Apolg. pro Harm. p. 74, and Prof. Stuart; the latter of whom shows we are not to resort to any metaphysical subtleties; what the natural and physiological powers of the sinner are, not being under discussion." In the explanation of vs. 19—21, the author inclines to the old interpretation, making κτίσις to mean the *whole creation*. The general sense of vs. 28—39 he expresses in the language of Prof. Stuart, which clearly ascribes to the apostle the doctrines of predestination and the perseverance of the saints. Yet in the details of the exposition he departs from the view given by the professor. Thus on v. 29, he says, "I see no reason to abandon the common interpretation of οὓς προέγνω, *those whom he foreknew would be such*, i. e. lovers of God. . . . The best commentators, ancient and modern, are mostly agreed that προέγνω is to be understood of the *prescience of character*, and προώρισε, of *determination founded on such prescience*." On v. 32 he says, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν does *not* (as the heterodox interpreters make it) signify *for our benefit*, but (as Koppe acknowledges) *in our stead*, and for the expiation of our sins."

The note on ch. 9: 5 is the most condensed and satisfactory that we have yet met with in the book. We must except, however, one rather singular remark, "Many modern commentators (even Stuart) think that ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός is equivalent to ὁ ὢν ὁ μέγιστος θεός, *who is the supreme God*, thus making God the Son supreme over God the Father." Yet to the interpretation itself the writer assents, only requiring that the "epithet *supreme* is not to be understood to imply any superiority over God the Father, but only over all created being, so that the passage shall testify the equality or rather the identity of Christ's deity with that of the Father." This is obviously all that was ever intended by the expression to which the exception is taken.

\* The reader will be surprised to notice in this work, among so many indications of scholarship on the part of the author, the almost constant occurrence of the inaccurate or inappropriate use of words, and of awkward expressions, as in the case just cited, "*devoted by the medium*," and on p. 41, "*preoccupies two objections*;" a latinism almost as bad as "*contort interpretations*," p. 16.



The notes on vs. 8, 9, 10, are, with some slight exceptions, such as a Calvinist might have written. For example, it is said on v. 8, "Here it is shown whatever difference might exist between Isaac and Ishmael, that was to be ascribed solely to the good pleasure and gracious promise of God." The author, however, would probably understand his own language in a manner somewhat different from that in which we should interpret it. On v. 11 we are told, "The apostle does not mean (as those of the Calvinistic persuasion imagine) that there is destined to all men individually a state either of eternal happiness or eternal misery, not according to the merits of each, but according to a divine decree, or on account of the imputation of Adam's sin." What can this mean, a state of eternal happiness destined to individuals on account of the imputation of Adam's sin? In the course of the extended note which follows, we have the usual objections to the argument derived from these verses, in favour of the doctrine of personal election. As, for example, that the apostle is not speaking of the whole human race; that he does not refer to the state of men in a future life; that he is not speaking of individuals but of the church; that Jacob and Esau are not spoken of as individuals, but as representing two nations, &c. &c. There is no intimation in all this that the writer does not decidedly reject the Calvinistic view of the apostle's argument. Yet he seems to find, when he gets to v. 14, that his own interpretation cannot be carried through, for we there meet with the following singular contradiction of what he had previously stated. "In not having bestowed on *all* the Israelites, but on *some* only, this blessing of faith in Christ [this is not an external privilege, but a saving grace, and a gift to individuals], the greater part being left in unbelief, the apostle shows that God does not act unjustly." And he finally fairly confesses that 'he is inclined to agree with the learned Professor Stuart,' and "to admit that the object of the apostle in this chapter may be not merely to vindicate the divine proceedings, in regard to giving or withholding favours in the present world, or the external privileges of religion; but also in respect to the future lot of saints and sinners in another." And on v. 15 he says, "The meaning is, in conferring privileges or favours, whether upon nations or *individuals*, God acts according to his *sovereign* pleasure." He appears, however, occasionally to relapse into his former opinion, for in relation to the expression *destined for glory*, v. 23, he says, "The *glory* here mentioned must be under-

stood, with Macknight, not of the glory of eternal life; for, as he observes, the scriptures never speak of *that* as bestowed on nations, or bodies of men complexly (v. 24), but of the glory of being made the church or people of God." This, as far as we can understand, is in direct contradiction to the exposition he had given of vs. 14—23. The remark on v. 29 is rather obscure, "Here we have another passage on the same subject with the preceding; namely, that it is to be ascribed to the singular goodness of God, that a very small part only (to the exclusion of the great bulk of the Jews) possess the promised felicity."

The interesting passage, 1 Cor. 1: 30, *who of him is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption*, is not very satisfactorily explained. The author, adopting the interpretation of Bp. Warburton, says, "*Wisdom and righteousness* describe a messenger sent from God with the publication of the eternal law of truth and right(?); *sanctification and redemption* denote the Messiah who was to atone for man's transgression, and restore him to his lost inheritance." Still less satisfactory is the author's exposition of chap. 3: 14, 15. "The ψυχικοί άνθρωποι are those who have the ψυχὴν (or animal and sensual principle, which man enjoys in common with the brutes) only, without having, or at least using, the πνεῦμα, or *intellectual faculty*, which is peculiar to man; and who are of course destitute of the illumination of the Holy Spirit; men who are either led by sensual impulses only, or rely solely on the light of nature, slighting every thing which cannot be brought to the evidence of the senses." As though this description could include all the rejecters of the gospel, and as though some of the most intellectual of men have not as much opposed to the 'things of the Spirit,' as the most sensual. It is plain that, according to the apostle's classification, every man who is not πνευματικός, i. e. under the influence of the Holy Spirit, is ψυχικός, i. e. under the guidance of his own natural principles; ψυχὴ means the whole mind or soul as often as it means the animal principle.

The difficult passage, in ch. 15: 28, respecting baptism for the dead, the author thinks means, 'What will they be doing, i. e. what will they benefit themselves, who are baptized for the sake of, i. e. in hope of, the resurrection of the dead.' In 2 Cor. 5: 14, (*The love of Christ constrained us, thus judging if one die for all, &c.*) the writer correctly considers the phrase *love of Christ* as meaning, his love towards us;

ὑπὲρ πάντων is paraphrased 'as an expiatory sacrifice for the sins of all.' It is better to abide by the simple meaning of the words as explained by the author on a previous passage, *instead of all*. The words ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον, he says, "almost all translators render, then *were all dead*. But to this version strong and well-founded objections are urged by Prof. Scholef (in his Hints, p. 50), who shows, 1. That it involves a strong confusion of terms; 2. That it is contrary to the *usus loquendi* of the apostle; and, 3. That ἀπέθανον cannot signify *I was dead*, but *I am dead*. I would render 'then are all dead,' as Col. 3: 3. The full meaning is, 'Then are all by nature spiritually dead,' i. e. in a state of condemnation, liable to eternal death; and, as it is implied, need to be brought into a state of salvation by the gospel." But to this interpretation the same objections may be urged; 1. It involves a strange confusion of terms; ἀπέθανον is used in one sense in the first part of the clause and in another in the second; 2. It is contrary to the *usus loquendi* of the apostle, inasmuch as he does not use the word ἀποθνήσκω without any adjunct to express the idea of spiritual death; and, 3. ἀπέθανον means neither *were* dead, nor *are* dead, but *died*. It means in the one member of the clause what it does in the other. 'If one died for all, then all died.' The meaning therefore is precisely what the apostle expresses in Rom. 6: 3—8, and 7: 4—6. 'If one died for all, then (in virtue of their union with him) all died; his death was virtually their death, and therefore as he lives we shall live also.' Comp. Gal. 2: 20, I am crucified with Christ, yet I live, &c.

The criticism on Gal. 2: 17, seems to us very obscure. Of εἰ δὲ ζητοῦντες δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χρ., &c. he says, "The best commentators, ancient and modern, are agreed the sense is, while we seek to attain justification from Christ, resting all our hopes of it on him; εὗρεθίμεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ *we be found sinners*; i. e. it be discovered that we are sinners; namely, by having rejected the Jewish law." After a few remarks on the difference of the words εὗρε and εἶναι he adds, 'εἰ εὗρε, ἁμαρ. signifies, if we are discovered to be yet in our sins, i. e. by clinging to the law and having recourse to its expiations.' Here are two contradictory explanations of the sense in which Paul uses the expression *found to be sinners*. The author overlooks the words καὶ αὐτοί, which give colour to the thought: *even we*, we in opposition to some other class of persons implied in the context. And that class is either those who do not seek to be justified by Christ, or the Gen-



tiles as distinguished from the Jewish Christians. The sense is then either, 'If seeking to be justified in Christ, even we (i. e. who thus seek, and because we thus seek) are found to be sinners, then is Christ the minister of sin;' or, 'If seeking to be justified in Christ, even we Jews are found to be sinners, i. e. in the same situation with the heathen, then,' &c. The difficult passage in v. 19, "I by the law am dead (*ἀπέθανον* died) to the law," is explained after Calvin, Beza, Winer and others to mean, "by the very nature of the law, with allusion to the extent and extreme minuteness of the law, which left no hope of fulfilling what it required. . . . Ipsa lex mihi causa fuit, ut eam desererem." This interpretation suits the expression itself better than it does the context. The apostle immediately adds, I am crucified with Christ; it is therefore by his being crucified with Christ that he is freed from the law; as he himself more clearly teaches in Rom. 7: 4, 'Ye have died to the law by the body of Christ.' In harmony with this and similar passages, the one before us seems rather to mean, 'I through the law, i. e. through the execution of the law on him with whom I died, am freed from the law.'\*

The expression in Gal. 5: 2, *Christ shall profit you nothing*, is explained, "The Christian religion will be of no avail to your salvation." Which is a mere adulteration of the text, weakening its force without explaining its meaning.

In Ephesians, ch. 1: 4, the phrase *ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ* *hath chosen us in him* is made to mean, "hath selected us, or shown us marks of peculiar favour by or through him. . . . The best commentators, ancient and modern [a standing formula with our author], are agreed that the election and predestination in question, solely relate to God's eternal purpose of bestowing the privileges of adoption (on which see note on Rom. 8: 15) upon the Ephesians and other sincere believers in Christ. This is confirmed by what is said at v. 3 of spiritual blessings of the highest kind being imparted to

\* "The law has (on account of sin) threatened me with death, condemned me to death; this legal death I have suffered with Christ, who took the punishment upon himself in our stead, since he died for all, all died: in so far, therefore, as I have suffered this death required by the law, the law has lost its authority over me, I through the law have died to the law." *Usteri Com. über den Galaterbrief.* Those German commentators whose philosophy has effected their thorough emancipation, generally understand the apostles very much as the reformers did. We may hope in time to see the same result realized in our own country. Entire indifference as to what the apostles taught, and a disposition to submit implicitly to their teaching, are found to lead to the same views of their doctrines.

them. Indeed, even candid Calvinistic commentators (see Doddridge) admit that the apostle has here no reference to the personal election of individuals, but to the election of whole communities and nations—even of the Gentiles, whom God was pleased to admit to the benefits of the gospel.” The holiness, however, to which believers are said to be chosen, v. 4, and the ‘spiritual blessings of the highest kind’ spoken of in v. 3, are surely personal favours, i. e. are blessings which pertain to individuals. Whole nations were not chosen to personal holiness and all the blessings of being the sons of God. The writer, we hope, supposes more is intended by *sonship* than the mere external relation in which all Christian nations stand to God. He refers us to Rom. 8: 15, for an explanation of the nature of this adoption, but we find there nothing on the subject, except the remark that υιοθεσία means *sonship* rather than adoption, and that πνεῦμα means *disposition*, and not the Holy Spirit. This is of itself, however, enough to show that he understands the υιοθεσία to be something more than the external relation of nominal Christians to God. Indeed, on this verse he had previously remarked that this adoption was bestowed on sincere believers. If this be the case, the election spoken of must be an election of individuals, for none other than individuals are in fact thus chosen to be personally holy and the sons of God. Besides, by what right does the author restrict the *us* here spoken of, “hath chosen *us*,” “having predestinated *us*,” to the Gentiles? There is not the slightest warrant for this in the context, nor in the form of expression. Paul surely meant to include himself, when he said God hath chosen *us* that we might be holy; and Paul was no Gentile. We can see no reason for understanding this passage in any other way than our author himself is obliged to understand some of the passages in Rom. 9, i. e. as teaching the doctrine of the personal election of individuals to spiritual and eternal blessings.

The exposition of the very difficult passage in v. 10, is unsatisfactory, both from its disproportionate brevity and its inaccuracy. The preposition *εἰς* he considers as expressing purpose. “The sense will then be [and this was done] for the purpose of displaying the plan of (or respecting) the fullness of times,” &c. But this includes much not contained in the text. It is much simpler to explain the connexion thus, ‘Having made known the mystery of his will (*εἰς*) *in reference to the plan*,’ &c. The infinitive ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι

he says is in apposition with οἰκονομίαν, and the sense is, *the plan*, “namely, that of bringing together into one body and uniting all beings under one Head, Christ.” Better, again, to make this infinitive exegetical of the μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, which is the dominant subject in the whole passage, ‘His secret purpose to bring all things to a harmonious union.’ By τὰ πάντα he understands “all intelligent beings, meaning both Jews and Gentiles;” and he immediately adds, “that by τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς are denoted the angels.” But this is impossible, or rather contradictory. The things in heaven and the things on earth are merely the apostle’s amplification of the *all things*. God purposes to bring together all things, whether in heaven or on earth: if then the *all things* mean Jews and Gentiles, *the things in heaven* cannot mean angels.

The 19th verse he understands as meaning that, “the future resurrection of believers shall be accomplished according to the working of that mighty power which he exerted in Christ when he raised him from the dead.” This we think inconsistent with the context, inasmuch as Paul illustrates our spiritual, and not our natural resurrection, by a reference to the resurrection of Christ; and at variance also with the parallel passage in Col. 2: 12, where our believing is ascribed to the energy of him who raised up Christ from the dead. The word θελήματα, in ch. 3: 3, he says, “denotes the *passions*, as σαρκὸς does the appetites of our corrupt nature. This natural corruption is *implied* in θελ. (which should be rendered *propensities*), and is *expressed* in the next words, which seem to be added for that very purpose. For though the φύσει there is tortured by many learned commentators to yield some such sense as shall exclude the doctrine of the natural corruption of the human heart (namely, either *custom* or *acquired habit*), yet in vain, for in all the passages cited the sense *natural disposition* always peeps forth.” And in the same strain through the note he insists on the usual orthodox interpretation of this passage.

The expression ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ, Col. 1: 15, we cannot think our author has either correctly or consistently explained. He tells us the meaning is, “Christ is (in his human nature) the visible image of the invisible God.” It is not, however, in his human nature, that Christ is the image of God; according to the analogy of the scriptures, and the language of the Jewish and Christian church, the terms *image*, *word*, *son*, are interchangeably used, not indeed as per-



fectly synonomous, but as referring to the divine nature of the Messiah. And this the author himself admits, for in the same note he tells us, "The present passage is manifestly parallel to that of Heb. 1: 3, ὅς ἐν ἀπαύρασμα κτλ. i. e. a true copy, similitude, or delineation of the Father: as fully representing his substance, essence, and attributes, as the impression answers to the seal." All this, of course, can be said only of the divine, and not of the human nature of Christ.

The celebrated passage in 2 Thess. 2: 3—12, relating to the apostacy and Man of Sin, our author considers as relating to events still future. The apostacy, therefore, here spoken of, is not the papacy, nor is the pope the Man of Sin. In these views our author coincides with what is called the 'prophetic school' in England. The almost equally disputed passage in 1 Tim. 3: 15, 16, he of course understands as strongly teaching the deity of Christ. He also regards the apostle as declaring that the church is "the pillar and foundation of the truth;" not however "the church of Rome, or the church of England or Scotland, or any particular church, but Christ's Holy Catholic church (for which we pray in our Liturgy), consisting of all the true churches of Christ throughout the world; i. e. all such churches as hold the essential doctrines of the gospel." We infer from this that our author does not regard the church of England, or churches furnished with prelatical bishops, as constituting the whole church of Christ. As this book is highly commended by some of the high-church Episcopal functionaries in this country, who seem to be fast verging to the papal spirit and principles of archbishop Laud, we hope such passages, from such a source, may serve to enlarge their hearts a little, and to convince them that confirmation (an external rite) is not "of as great importance as repentance, faith, baptism, and the doctrine of future resurrection or eternal judgment."\* This is a monstrous sentiment for a Christian to utter in any age, and a marvellous one for any man living in the nineteenth century to entertain. We do not agree with our author, however, in his view of

\* See the *MISSIONARY* (published in Burlington, N. J.) for Feb. 25, 1837. If any thing can be more wonderful than the sentiment quoted above, it is the proof of the apostolic origin of the rite of confirmation derived by the writer in the *Missionary*, from Acts 15: 41, "And Paul went through Syria and Cilicia CONFIRMING the churches." The reader must not overlook the capitals, for therein lies the argument. The only parallel to this specimen of interpretation which we know of, is the appeal made by the Shakers to the exhortation, "Turn ye, turn ye," in defence of their rotary dancing. The Shaker, we think, has the better of it, as the word *turn* occurs twice in his text.

this passage. We do not think that, contrary to the uniform language and mode of representation of the scriptures, Paul represents even the "CHURCH UNIVERSAL" as the pillar and foundation of the truth. Agreeably to the punctuation adopted by Bengel, Griesbach, Knapp, and other editors, the passage gives a very different sense. There should be a full point after *church of the living God*, and a new sentence should commence with στήλος. 'A pillar, and foundation of the truth, and confessedly great, is the mystery of godliness. God manifest in the flesh.' The whole structure of the passage is in favour of this interpretation. The words τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον are the subject of the sentence, and στήλος, ἐδραίωμα, μέγα, connected by the conjunction καί, and without the article, form the predicate. It is very unnatural to disjoin the words *a pillar* and *foundation* and *beyond contradiction great*, &c.

The commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews appears to be more elaborate than that on most other portions. And here our author, perhaps, will be found to differ less from his brethren of other denominations. His exposition of the first chapter is, as far as we have examined it, in accordance with the common interpretation. With regard to the difficult passage in the second chapter, beginning with v. 5, he does not appear to be very clear. There are three leading views which may be taken of the course of the apostle's argument. The first and most commonly adopted, and as we think, the most natural is, that the apostle here introduces a new consideration in proof of the superiority of Christ to Moses and the angels, derived from his exaltation over ALL THINGS, agreeably to the language of the eighth Psalm. The second view is, that he intends to answer an objection of the Jews against his preceding statement of the superiority of Christ to angels, founded on the fact that he was a man. This is adopted by Heinrichs, Stuart and others. The third is that of Storr, who supposes the apostle designs to show the greatness of the blessedness secured by the gospel, from the consideration that "the world to come" is put in subjection to us men, and not to angels. Our author unites the first and second of these views, which union serves only to produce indistinctness and confusion. In respect to the use and application of Ps. 8, the author adopts a middle course, and says, that "bishop Middleton shows that this psalm is an instance of the existence in the Old Testament, of passages having both a primary and secondary sense, i. e. capable of a

two-fold application, being *directly* applicable to circumstances then past, or present, or soon to be accomplished; and *indirectly* to others which the Divine Providence was about to develope under a future dispensation." At the end of the paragraph, he adds, "see a confirmation of this view in Prof. Stuart's Excursus IV." We suspect the professor will be startled to find himself quoted in behalf of the double sense, which he has always maintained to be tantamount to no sense at all.

On ch. 9: 28 also, he refers to Mr. Stuart, in support of the orthodox interpretation of the phrase ἀνεσχυεῖν ἀμαρτίας, and in this case with great propriety, for in his commentary, Mr. Stuart says, "*To bear the sins means to bear the punishment, i. e. to suffer the penalty due to sin.*" And χωρὶς ἀμαρτίας means, "Without again suffering the penalty due to sin." This, considering all that has been written by Prof. Stuart and his followers against the doctrine of the imputation of sin, or the idea that one person can justly suffer the penalty due to the sin of another, or that Christ's sufferings were penal, is certainly very remarkable.

We fear we are extending our remarks to an unreasonable length. It is unnecessary to proceed farther, as enough has been said and quoted to give our readers an idea of the work before us. It is very unequal in its different portions; that devoted to the Epistle to the Hebrews being much the best that we have had time to examine. The elegance and correctness with which this work is printed, its convenient form, the varied learning displayed in the annotations, and the kind and moderate spirit which is characteristic of the author recommend it strongly to the biblical student. But if he look for condensed and clear statements of difficult points, or consistent exhibitions of doctrinal truths, or even skill in the work of exposition, he will be disappointed.

After so minute a notice of Bloomfield's work, we shall hardly be able to do more than mention that of Townsend, which the same liberal and enterprising publishers have placed within the reach of American readers. It is somewhat singular that two productions of the English Episcopal school, both strongly marked with its peculiarities, should be reprinted at the same time, in the capital city of congregational America. Townsend's work differs from Bloomfield's in presenting the English version instead of the Greek text, arranged, according to his judgment, chronologically. His



notes, however, are not exclusively adapted to the English reader. They are chiefly characterized by a variety and abundance, not only of references, but of quotations, within the usual circle of an English theologian. They evince more industry and knowledge of books than originality or depth. As to the plan of the work, there may be cases in which, or persons to whom, it would be highly useful, and as a book of reference, it well deserves a place upon the student's table; but to most, we are persuaded, its complexity will make it nearly useless. However pleasing such a plan in theory may be, there can be little hope of practical utility, when almost every reader feels himself embarrassed in attempting to make use of it. Without a careful study of the plan itself, it is scarcely possible to find what one wants in such a volume. To peruse the Bible once, as thus arranged, with due attention to the principle of arrangement, would no doubt be a profitable exercise to students; but for ordinary use, the original form is immeasurably better. We say this, of course, with special reference to the gospels, but the same remark admits, though in a less degree, of general application. Our own judgment, after all experiments, is still in favour of the Bible as it is. In justice to Townsend, we must add, however, that, unlike Bloomfield, he has furnished very copious analyses, as titles to his sections; and that, so far as we have yet examined, they seem well constructed.

The American reprint, besides the usual revisions and minor improvements, differs from the original edition in two points. In the first place, the distinction of verses is exchanged for that of paragraphs determined by the sense. This is a great improvement in the main. Our only doubt is in relation to that feature of the plan which consists in the metrical arrangement of poetical quotations from the books of the Old Testament. There seems to be a mania for this mode of printing among some of our translators and editors. In commentaries on the poetical parts of scripture, where there is perpetual reference to the parallelism of the clauses as a source of illustration, such a method may be useful. But to print the most familiar texts in blank-verse form, where nothing can be gained in clearness or effect, looks to us like affectation. We doubt whether taste and learning would not be the gainers, if this process were reversed, and even English poetry printed just like prose, after the fashion of the German hymn-books. It would then at least be harder to impose prosaic verse upon the public. But whatever the in-

trinsic merit of the other plan may be, it does not seem to be entirely in keeping with the paragraph system, which proceeds upon the principle of excluding all unnecessary breaks and interruptions. If the division of the text into single lines or clauses is so very useful, there is the less objection to the form adopted in most English Bibles, where the clauses, in a very great majority of instances, are printed two by two. Still, however, our principal objection is to the unnecessary waste of room, and the apparent affectation of printing the most familiar texts as follows:

(Heb. 2: 5.) For unto which of the angels said he at any time,

“Thou art my son,

This day have I begotten thee ?”

And again,

“I will be to him a Father,

And he shall be to me a son ?”

Instead of enhancing the poetical effect upon the English reader, this method seems more likely to impair it, by exciting the expectation of what we call verse, and then presenting what, in form at least, is prose. We may add, that Dr. Coit could hardly have found a worse occasion for applying this favorite typographical improvement, than in editing Townsend, whose worst fault is the number and complexity of his subdivisions, while the paragraph-arrangement is specifically intended to guard, as far as possible, against that very evil.

The other point of difference between the two editions lies in the style of mechanical execution. There may have been a late reprint in England, which we have not seen; but the old edition has no pretensions to elegance or splendor. The American royal octavo, on the other hand, is one of the best specimens which we have seen of American typography. Its whole appearance is not merely neat, but noble. We understand that the Old Testament is stereotyping and will soon appear.

THE  
BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

PRINCETON REVIEW

Is published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, (payable in advance) at *three dollars per annum, by*

JAMES A. PEABODY,

*No. 29, Sansom Street, Philadelphia.*

☞ According to the terms above, subscriptions to the present volume should have been paid by this time, yet but few have been received. The extra expense to which the Proprietor has been subjected in the endeavour to increase the circulation of the work, makes it desirable that the payment of subscriptions should be prompt. Remittances (post-paid for all sums under \$10) may be made agreeably to the above direction.

☞ It is a standing rule of the Publisher to send the Repertory to those subscribers who do not give notice of discontinuance by the 1st of January. No publication can be sustained by allowing the subscriber to discontinue any time at option. This notice is therefore given to prevent any mistake or returning of numbers; and the rule must be adhered to by Agents.

The Repertory has been in existence about ten years, and its great excellence is acknowledged. But although its patrons are increasing, it has not yet met that support which it deserves, and *needs*, in order that the objects of its publication may be secured. This circumstance is supposed to be owing to the fact that the attention of ministers and laymen of the Presbyterian Church has not been adequately called to the work. If the merits of the Repertory were known, and properly appreciated, it is believed that few, if any, intelligent clergymen or laymen would be willing to be without it. It is the only journal of the kind in this country whose aim is to defend and illustrate the doctrines and polity of the Presbyterian Church: that this has been done with ability, those will testify who have long been subscribers.

In the department of Biblical and other learned criticism, it may safely challenge comparison with any other journal. In this respect, it has but to be known to convince the student and divine of its great worth.

As a review of the current literature of the day,—the purity of style, sprightliness of manner, and depth of research which characterize its various reviews, strongly commend it also to the *general* reader.

But almost the entire labour of writing articles and editing it heretofore, has devolved on a few gentlemen at Princeton. This onerous service has been cheerfully borne by them from year to year with the hope, that the success of the work would, in part at least, relieve them. To call the attention of ministers and laymen of the Presbyterian Church to the necessity of sustaining the Repertory, is the object of this circular. It is not contemplated to make any change in the editorial department of the work,—*that* will still continue with the association at Princeton. But it is the desire of both Editors and Proprietor, that its circulation should be so extended as to allow them to pay liberally for contributions to its pages. So that, in



addition to those who are accustomed to furnish matter for it, the aid of a still larger number of the ablest writers in the Church may be secured.

In order to promote unity of sentiment on topics of vital importance to the interests of the Presbyterian Church, and to present able discussions of subjects of *general* interest to Christians, the undersigned think that some such vehicle is needed, and will go far, if generally patronized, to allay the present difficulties of the Church. We therefore cheerfully recommend the Biblical Repertory to the Christian public.

Jno. M. Campbell, Pastor 1st Presbyterian Church, Albany, N. Y.

W. B. Sprague, Pastor 2d Presbyterian Church, Albany, N. Y.

Tryon Edwards, Pastor 1st Church, Rochester, N. Y.

Joseph Penney, President Hamilton College, N. Y.

W. W. Phillips, Pastor 1st Presbyterian Church, N. Y.

Gardiner Spring, Pastor Brick Church, N. Y.

Joseph M'Elroy, Pastor Scotch Presbyterian Church, N. Y.

George Potts, Pastor Duane street Church, N. Y.

John M. Krebs, Pastor Rutger street Church, N. Y.

Ashbel Green, Philadelphia.

Fr. M'Farland, Corr. Sec'y. Board of Education, Philadelphia.

Cors, C. Cuyler, Pastor 2d Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.

John M'Dowell, Pastor Central Church, Philadelphia.

Henry A. Boardman, Pastor 10th Presbyterian Church, Philad.

John C. Backus, Pastor 1st Presbyterian Church, Baltimore.

William M'Pheeters, Fayetteville, N. C.

H. Potter, North Carolina.

Jas. W. Douglass, Pastor Presbyterian Church, Fayetteville, N. C.

Thomas Smyth, Pastor 2d Church, Charleston, S. C.

R. Post, Pastor Circular Church, Charleston, S. C.

Wm. C. Dana, Pastor 3d Church, Charleston, S. C.

Erastus Hopkins, Pastor Church Beech Island, S. C.

Benj. Gildersleeve, Editor Charleston Observer.

Saml. K. Talmage, Professor Oglethorpe University, Georgia.

C. H. Howard, Professor Oglethorpe University, Georgia.

Wm. L. Breckinridge, Pastor Presbyterian Church, Louisville, Ky.

John C. Young, President Centre College, Danville, Ky.

Lewis Green, Professor Centre College, Danville, Ky.

A. B. Leland, Prof. Theol. Sem. Columbia, S. C.

George Howe, do. do.

Philip Lindsley, President University, Nashville, Tenn.

John T. Edgar, Pastor Presbyterian Church, Nashville, Tenn.

George Baxter, Professor Theol. Sem. Prince Edward, Va.

Hiram P. Goodrich, do. do. do.

E. Balentine, do. do. do.

James H. Thornwell, South Carolina.

George W. Musgrave, Pastor 3d Presbyterian Church, Baltimore.

The names of persons recommending the Repertory, to an almost indefinite number might be added to the preceding list, but it is unnecessary.

## CONTENTS OF NO. III.

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| ART. I.—The Life of Jerome Savonarola, . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 299 |
| ART. II.—A Discussion of the question, Is the Roman Catholic Religion,<br>in any or in all its Principles or Doctrines, inimical to Civil<br>or Religious Liberty? And of the question, Is the Presby-<br>terian Religion, in any or in all its Principles or Doctrines,<br>inimical to Civil or Religious Liberty? By the Reverend<br>John Hughes of the Roman Catholic Church, and the Re-<br>verend John Breckinridge of the Presbyterian Church, | 326 |
| ART. III.—A Recovered Tract of President Davies, . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 349 |
| ART. IV.—Views in Theology, by Lyman Beecher, D.D., President of<br>Lane Theological Seminary, . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 364 |
| ART. V.—General Assembly of 1837, . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 407 |
| Notice, . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 486 |

